Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BR131 .B613
Bingham, Joseph, 1668-1723. BinghMAIN
The works of the Rev. Joseph Bingham / e
3 9967 00087 8277

ACCESSION NUMBER SHELF NUMBER

10244 BR131
B613

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the Corning Fund.

RECEIVED

THE WORKS

OF

THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

EDITED BY

HIS LINEAL DESCENDANT

THE REV. R. BINGHAM, JUN., M.A.

FORMERLY OF MAGDALENE HALL, OXFORD,

AND

FOR MANY YEARS CURATE OF TRINITY CHURCH, GOSPORT.

A NEW EDITION, IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

McCormick
LIBRARY
Theological Seminary.

OXFORD:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

M.DCCC.LV.

254

131
B61

CONTENTS

OF THE

ELEVENTH, TWELFTH, AND THIRTEENTH BOOKS

OF

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XI.

OF THE RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the several names and appellations of baptism in the Primitive Church.

SECT. I. The names of baptism most commonly taken from the spiritual effects of it, 1.—II. Hence baptism called *indulgentia, indulgence* or *absolution*, 2.—III. And παλιγγενεσία, *regeneration;* and χρίσμα, the *unction*, 3.—IV. And φωτισμὸς, *illumination*, 5.—V. And *salus, salvation*, 6.—VI. From the nature and substance of it, it was called *mysterium, sacramentum*, and σφραγὶς, 6.—VII. And *character Dominicus, the mark* or *character of the Lord*, 10.—VIII. Why called the sacrament of faith and repentance, 11.—IX. The notation of the names *baptism, tinction, laver*. That they do not universally denote immersion, 11.—X. Of some other names given to baptism. The *great circumcision*, δῶρον and χάρισμα, *the gift of the Lord, viaticum*, and *phylacterium*, τελείωσις, μύησις, and *symbola*, 12.

CHAPTER II.

Of the matter of baptism: with an account of such heretics as rejected or corrupted baptism by water.

SECT. I. Baptism wholly rejected by the heretics called Ascodrutæ, and Marcosians, and Valentinians, and Quintillians, 15.—II. And by the Archontici, 16.—III. And the Seleucians and Hermians, 17.—IV. And Manichees and Paulicians, 18.—V. What opinion the Messalians or Euchites had of baptism, 21.

CHAPTER III.

Of the ancient form of baptism: and of such heretics as altered or corrupted it.

SECT. I. The usual form of baptizing, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, 26.—II. This form of words generally thought necessary to be used in baptism, 27.—III. Whether baptism in the name of Christ alone was ever allowed in the Church, 31.—IV. Of alterations

made in the form of baptism. First, by the Tritheists and Priscillianists, 33.—V. Secondly, by the Menandrians, 34.—VI. Thirdly, by the Elcesians, 35.—VII. Fourthly, by the Sabellians and Montanists, 36.—VIII. Fifthly, by the Marcosians, 38.—IX. Sixthly, by the Paulianists, 38.—X. Seventhly, by the Eunomians and others who baptized into the death of Christ, 39.—XI. Whether all the Arians were guilty of the same innovation, 41.—XII. Whether any additions were made to the form of baptism in the Catholic Church, 43.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the subjects of baptism, or an account of what persons were anciently allowed to be baptized. Where particularly of infant-baptism.

Sect. I. Why the question about the administrators of baptism is here omitted, 44.—II. Who were anciently reckoned the proper subjects of baptism. Where of the corrupt custom of baptizing inanimate things, as bells in the Roman Church, 46.—III. Baptism not to be given to the dead, 47.—IV. Nor to the living for the dead. Where of the Apostle's meaning of "being baptized for the dead," 1 Cor. 15, 29; 48.—V. Proofs of infant-baptism from the ancient records of the Church, 52.—VI. From Clemens Romanus and Hermes Pastor, 53.—VII. From Justin Martyr, 57.—VIII. And the author of the Recognitions, contemporary with Justin Martyr, 58.—IX. From Irenæus, 59.—X. And Tertullian, 61.—XI. And Origen, 63.—XII. And Cyprian, with the Council of Carthage under him, 64.—XIII. Infant-baptism not to be delayed to the eighth day, after the example of circumcision, 66. Nor till three years, as Gregory Nazianzen would have had it, 68.—XIV. Yet in some Churches it was deferred to the time of an approaching festival, 69.—XV. A resolution of some questions concerning infant-baptism. Whether children might be baptized when only one parent was Christian? 70.—XVI. Whether the children of excommunicated parents might be baptized? 71.—XVII. Whether exposed children, whose parents were unknown, might be baptized? 72.—XVIII. Whether the children of Jews or Heathens might be baptized in any case whatsoever? 73.—XIX. Whether children, born while their parents were Heathen, might be baptized? 74.

CHAPTER V.

Of the baptism of adult persons.

Sect. I. No adult persons to be baptized without previous instruction to qualify them to answer for themselves, 76.—II. Yet dumb persons allowed to be baptized in some certain cases, 76.—III. And energumens in cases of extremity, 79.—IV. No slave to be baptized without the testimony of his master, 81.—V. Yet baptism to be a voluntary act, and no one to be compelled to receive it by force, 82.—VI. What persons were rejected from baptism; with a particular account of some certain trades and vocations which kept men from it. Such were image-making and stage-playing, 84.—VII. Gladiators, charioteers, and other gamesters, 86.—VIII. Astrologers and practisers of such other curious

arts, 88.—IX. Frequenters of the public games and theatre, 89.—X. In what case the military life might unqualify men for baptism, 90.—XI. Whether persons might be baptized who lived in the state of concubinage, 93.—XII. The peculiar error of the Marcionites in rejecting all married persons from baptism, 96.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the time and place of baptism.

SECT. I. Why adult persons sometimes delayed baptism by order of the Church, 97.—II. Private reasons for deferring baptism against the rules of the Church. First, supinity and negligence of salvation, 98.—III. Secondly, an unwillingness to renounce the world, and submit to the severities of religion, 98.—IV. Thirdly, a fear of falling after baptism, 99.—V. Fourthly, superstitious fancies in reference to the time and place, and ministers of baptism, 101.—VI. Fifthly, a pretence of following the example of Christ, who was baptized at thirty years of age, 103.—VII. The solemn times appointed for baptism by the Church were Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany, 105.—VIII. And in some places the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs, and the anniversary days of the dedication of churches prevailed also, 111.—IX. No such stated times in the days of the Apostles, 112.—X. How far these rules obliging in future ages, 114.—XI. Baptism not confined to any place in the apostolical age, 115.—XII. But in after ages confined to the baptisteries of the church, 116.—XIII. Except in the case of sickness, or with the bishop's license to the contrary, upon some special occasions, 118.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the renunciations and professions made by all persons immediately before their baptism.

SECT. I. Three things required of all persons at their baptism, first, to renounce the Devil, 119.—II. The form of this renunciation, and the import of it, 119.—III. The antiquity of this renunciation. By some derived from the Apostles, 122.—IV. This renunciation made by persons standing with their faces toward the west. The reason of this practice, with some other ceremonies, 124.—V. Why this renunciation made three times, 125.—VI. The second thing required of men at their baptism was a vow or covenant of obedience to Christ, 127.—VII. This vow of obedience made by turning to the east, and why, 130.—VIII. The third thing required of the party to be baptized was a profession of faith in the usual words of the Creed, 131.—IX. This confession made in the most solemn and public matter, 133.—X. With hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, 135.—XI. Repeated three times, 135.—XII. And subscribed with their own hands in the books of the Church, as some think, 136.—XIII. The use of all these ceremonies and engagements to make men sensible of their obligation, and steadfast to their profession, 138.—XIV. Whether public and particular confession of sins was required of men at their baptism, 141.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the use of sponsors or sureties in baptism.

SECT. I. Three sorts of sponsors in the Primitive Church. First, for children, 143.—II. Parents commonly sponsors for their own children, 143.—III. Other sureties not bound to maintain the children for whom they were sponsors, 145.—IV. But only to answer for them to the several interrogatories in baptism, 146.—V. And to be guardians of their spiritual life for the future, 149.—VI. The second sort of sponsors for such adult persons as could not answer for themselves, 150.—VII. The third sort of sponsors for all adult persons in general, 151.—VIII. Whose duty was, not to answer in their names, but only to admonish and instruct them before and after baptism, 152.—IX. This office chiefly imposed upon deacons and deaconesses, 152.—X. What persons prohibited from being sponsors, 153.—XI. But one sponsor required, and that a man for a man, and a woman for a woman, 154.—XII. When first it became a law that sponsors might not marry a spiritual relation, 154.—XIII. Why the names of the sponsors ordered to be registered in the books of the Church, 156.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the unction and the sign of the cross in baptism.

SECT. I. Of the first original of unction in baptism, 157.—II. Of the difference between this and chrism in confirmation, 158.—III. The design of this unction, and the reason of it, 160.—IV. The sign of the cross frequently used in the ceremonies of baptism. First, in the admission of catechumens; and secondly, in the time of exorcism, 161.—V. Thirdly, in this unction before baptism, 162.—VI. Fourthly, in the unction of confirmation, 164.

CHAPTER X.

Of the consecration of the water in baptism.

SECT. I. The consecration of the water made by prayer, 166.—II. An ancient form of this prayer in the Constitutions, 169.—III. The sign of the cross used in this consecration, 171.—IV. The effects and change wrought by this consecration, the same as in the bread and wine in the eucharist, 172.—V. How far these prayers of consecration reckoned necessary in the Church, 177.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the different ways of baptizing by immersion, trine immersion, and aspersion in the case of clinic baptism.

SECT. I. All persons anciently divested in order to be baptized, 177.—II. No exception in this case either with respect to women or children, 180.—III. Yet matters were so ordered, as that no indecency might be committed, 181.—IV. Baptism usually performed by immersion, 182.—V. Yet aspersion allowed in some extraordinary cases, 184.—VI. Trine immersion, the general practice for several ages, and the reason of this, 188.—VII. The original of this practice, 190.—VIII. When first the Church allowed of any alteration in it, 192.

BOOK XII.

OF CONFIRMATION, AND OTHER CEREMONIES FOLLOWING BAPTISM, BEFORE MEN WERE MADE PARTAKERS OF THE EUCHARIST.

CHAPTER I.

Of the time when, and the persons to whom confirmation was administered.

SECT. I. Confirmation anciently given immediately after baptism, if the bishop were present, 196.—II. And this as well to infants as adult persons. Which is evidenced first from some plain testimonies, 198.—III. And secondly, from the custom of giving the eucharist to infants for many ages, 202.—IV. Whence it appears, that confirmation was not esteemed a proper sacrament distinct from baptism, 202.—V. No, not when it was separate from baptism, as in the case of heretics, who were baptized out of the Church, 206.—VI. No necessity of giving confirmation to infants now, any more than the eucharist, from the example of the Primitive Church, 207.

CHAPTER II.

Of the minister of confirmation.

SECT. I. The consecration of chrism reserved only to the office of bishops by the canons, 208.—II. The use of the chrism divided between the office of bishops and presbyters, 210.—III. The other ceremony of imposition of hands reserved more strictly to the office of bishops, 214.—IV. Yet in some special cases, presbyters by commission allowed to minister it also. As first, when bishops particularly required their presbyters to do it to such as were baptized in the Church, 217.—V. Secondly, presbyters might administer it to the energumens, who were baptized at a distance from the bishop's church, 218.—VI. And thirdly, to such as were baptized in heresy or schism, in case they were in danger of death, 218.

CHAPTER III.

Of the manner of administeriag confirmation and the ceremonies used in the celebration of it.

SECT. I. The first ceremony of confirmation was the unction of chrism, 220.—II. The original of this unction, 220.—III. The form and manner of administering it, together with the effects of it, 221.—IV. The second ceremony of confirmation was the sign of the cross, 224.—V. The third and most noted ceremony of confirmation was imposition of hands; and the fourth, prayer joined therewith, 224.—VI. The original of the ceremony of imposition of hands, 225.—VII. What opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of confirmation, 231.—VIII. How they punished those that neglected it, 233.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the remaining ceremonies of baptism following confirmation.

SECT. I. Persons newly baptized, clothed in white garments, 234.—II. These sometimes delivered to them with a solemn form of words, 236.

—III. Worn eight days and then laid up in the church, 236.—IV. The ceremony of lights and tapers. What intended by it. And at whose charge both these were provided, 238.—V. The kiss of peace given to persons newly baptized, 240.—VI. And a taste of honey and milk in token of their new birth, 241.—VII. Then they were required to repeat the Lord's Prayer, 243.—VIII. And received into the Church with psalmody, 244.—IX. And admitted immediately to the communion of the altar, 244.—X. Of the ceremony of washing the feet, retained in some Churches, 245.—XI. A general reflection upon the whole preceding discourse, with relation to the practice of the present Church, 248.

CHAPTER V.

Of the laws against rebaptization both in Church and State.

SECT. I. But one baptism, properly so called, allowed by the Church, 249.—II. Only the Marcionites allowed baptism to be thrice repeated, 252.—III. What the Church did in doubtful cases, not reckoned a rebaptization, 252.—IV. Nor when she baptized those who had been unduly baptized before in heresy or schism, 253.—V. Apostates never rebaptized in the Catholic Church, 254.—VI. What heretics rebaptized the Catholics, 255.—VII. What punishments were inflicted on rebaptizers by the laws of Church and State, 258.

BOOK XIII.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO DIVINE WORSHIP IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Some necessary remarks upon the ancient names of divine service, which modern corruptions have rendered ambiguous.

SECT. I. The partition of this work, 261.—II. Of the *missa catechumenorum*, or *ante-communion-service*, to which all orders of men were admitted, 262.—III. Of the *missa fidelium*, or *communion-service*, peculiar to communicants only, 265.—IV. The true original and meaning of the ancient name *missa*, *the mass*, which in its primitive use denotes every part of divine service; but no where an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, 267.—V. In what sense divine service anciently called *sacrifice*, *sacrificium*, 271.—VI. And *sacramenta*, 273.—VII. And *cursus ecclesiasticus*, 274.—VIII. The names λειτουργία, ἱερουργία, ἱερὰ, and μυσταγωγία, most usual in the Greek Church, 275.—IX. Liturgies sometimes taken for set forms of prayer, 278.—X. Of litanies. This at first a general name of prayers. How and when it came to be appropriated to certain particular forms of worship, called *rogations* 279.—XI. Of the distinction between greater and lesser litanies, 284.—XII. Of their processions, 287.

CHAPTER II.

That the devotions of the Ancient Church were paid to every Person of the blessed Trinity.

SECT. I. Proofs of the worship of Christ, as the Son of God, or second Person of the Blessed Trinity in the first century, 288.—II. Proofs of the same in the second century, from the testimony of Pliny, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Acts of Polycarp, the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Lucian, Irenæus, Theophilus Antiochenus, Clemens of Alexandria, Athenogenes, the Acts of Andronicus, and Tertullian, 290.—III. Proofs of the worship of Christ in the third century, out of Caius Romanus, the Council of Antioch, Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, Novatian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, the Acts of the Martyrs in Eusebius, the Acts of Felix, Thelica, Emeritus, Glycerius, Olympius, and many others. The force of this argument to prove the divinity of Christ upon this Christian principle,—that divine honour was to be given to none but God only, 299.—IV. The proofs of the worship of the Holy Ghost, from the testimony of Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Lucian, Theophilus, Clemens of Alexandria, Athenogenes, Origen, the Author of the Recognitions under the name of Clemens Romanus. The Ancients charged with tritheism, by Praxeas and the Sabellians upon the account of their worshipping the Holy Trinity. The worship of the Holy Ghost proved further from the testimony of Cyprian, Firmilian, and Gregory Thaumaturgus, 316.—V. In what sense all prayers are ordered to be directed to the Father, 323.

CHAPTER III.

That in the Ancient Church, religious worship was given to no creature, saint, or angel, cross, image, or relic, but to God alone.

SECT. I. This position proved, first, from their general declarations against giving religious worship to any creature, 324.—II. Secondly, from their denying the worship of saints and angels in particular, and condemning it as idolatry, 328.—III. Thirdly, from their charging the practice of it upon heretics and Heathens only, 335.

CHAPTER IV.

That anciently divine service was always performed in the vulgar tongue understood by the people.

SECT. I. This proved, first, from plain testimonies of the Ancients asserting it, 341.—II. Secondly, from the people's joining in psalmody and prayer, and making their proper responses in the liturgy, 345.—III. Thirdly, from the frequent exhortations of the Fathers to the people, to hear, and read, and pray with understanding, 346.—IV. Fourthly, from the references made by the Fathers in their sermons to the prayers and lessons in the service of the Church, 347.—V. Fifthly, from the Scriptures being translated into all languages from the first foundation of Churches, 347.—VI. Sixthly, from the use of the order of interpreters in the Church, 349.—VII. Seventhly, from the custom of having Bibles

laid in churches, for the people to read in private, 350.—VIII. Eighthly, from the general allowance granted to all men to have and read the Scriptures in their mother-tongue. Which privilege was never infringed by any but the Heathen persecutors, 351.—IX. From the liberty granted to children and catechumens to join in the public prayers, and read the Scriptures, 357.—X. From the form and tenor of the ordination of readers in the Church, 360.

CHAPTER V.

Of the original and use of liturgies in stated and set forms of prayer in the Primitive Church.

SECT. I. Every bishop at liberty in the first ages to order the form of divine service in his own church, 364.—II. In after-ages the churches of a whole province by consent conformed to the liturgy of the metropolitical church, 366.—III. Why none of the ancient liturgies are now remaining perfect and entire as they were in their first original, 368.—IV. What forms were used in the Apostles' days. Where of the ancient forms used by the Jews in their temple-worship and synagogue-service. How our Saviour and his Apostles complied with the use of them. What new forms were introduced by the Apostles into the Christian service, 371.—V. What evidence there is of the use of set forms in the second century, from the testimony of Pliny, Ignatius, Lucian, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the Acts of St. Perpetua and Felicitas, 379.—VI. Evidence of set forms in the third century, from the testimony of Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Council of Antioch, Caius Romanus, Nepos, Dionysius of Alexandria, Athenogenes, and Cornelius, bishop of Rome, 390.—VII. Evidences of set forms in the fourth century, from the testimony of Arnobius, Lactantius, Eusebius, the Forms of Licinius, and Constantine, Athanasius, Juvencus, Pachomius, Flavian, bishop of Antioch, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary of Poictiers, the Council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Optatus, Basil, Ephrem Syrus, the practice of Arius and Eunomius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, St. Austin, and the Councils of Carthage and Milevis, 400.

CHAPTER VI.

An extract of the several parts of the ancient liturgy out of the genuine writings of St. Chrysostom, following the order of his works.

SECT. I. Parts of the liturgy in the first tome, 440.—II. Parts of the liturgy in the second tome of St. Chrysostom's Works, 449.—III. Part of the ancient liturgy in the third tome, 450.—IV. Parts of the ancient liturgy in the fourth tome of St. Chrysostom's works, 455.—V. In the fifth tome, 456.—VI. In the sixth tome, 461.—VII. In the seventh tome of his Homilies on St. Matthew, 464.—VIII. In the eighth tome, on St. John and the Acts of the Apostles, 465.—IX. In the ninth tome, on Romans, and on the first and second to the Corinthians, 467.—X. In the tenth tome, 473.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the liturgy of the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. The Lord's Prayer esteemed by all the Ancients a form given by Christ to be used by all his disciples, 480.—II. Accordingly it was used by the Primitive Church in all her public offices: particularly in the administration of baptism, 483.—III. And in the celebration of the eucharist, 483.—IV. And in their morning and evening prayers, 485.—V. And in their private devotions, 486.—VI. Whence it had the name of *oratio quotidiana, the Christian's daily prayer*, 487.—VII. And was used by all heretics and schismatics as well as Catholics, 488.—VIII. That it was esteemed a divine and spiritual form of prayer, 489.—IX. And the use of it esteemed a peculiar privilege, allowed only to communicants and perfect Christians, 492.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the use of habits, and gesture, and other rites and ceremonies in the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. No certain evidences for the use of distinct habits in the apostolical or the two following ages, 493.—II. What evidence there is for them in the fourth century, 495.—III. Four postures of devotion spoken of by the Ancients. First, Standing, which was particularly enjoined on the Lord's day, and all the time between Easter and Pentecost, 499.—IV. Secondly, Kneeling at all other times, especially on the stationary days, and other times of devotion, 503.—V. Thirdly, Bowing down the head, or inclination of the body, 505.—VI. Fourthly, Prostration, 506.—VII. Sitting not an allowed posture of devotion, 507.—VIII. Some superstitious practices in devotion noted by Tertullian, as bathing the body, and putting off their cloaks when they went to prayer, 509.—IX. That the Ancients always prayed uncovered, 510.—X. And lifted up their hands toward heaven, sometimes in the form of a cross, 511.—XI. But yet were great enemies to all theatrical gestures, 513.—XII. What ceremonies they used at their entrance into the church, 516.—XIII. That the bishop saluted the people with the form, *pax vobis*, at his entrance into the church, 517.—XIV. And the people gave alms to the poor, who stood before the gates of the church for this purpose, 517.—XV. That they worshipped toward the east, with the reasons for this practice, 519.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the times of their religious assemblies, and the several parts of divine service performed in them.

SECT. I. No certain rule for meeting in public, except upon the Lord's day, in times of persecution for the first two ages, 523.—II. The original of the stationary-days, or church assemblies on Wednesdays and Fridays, and what divine service was performed on those days, 525.—III. Saturday or the Sabbath anciently observed with great solemnity, as a day of public devotion, 527.—IV. How they observed the vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's-day, and other incidental festivals of mar-

tyrs, 529.—V. Of the festivals of martyrs, their original, and what divine service was performed on those days, 535.—VI. Solemn assemblies for preaching and other acts of divine worship held every day during the whole forty days of Lent, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, 538.—VII. Public prayer morning and evening every day in the third century, 539.—VIII. The original of the canonical hours of prayer. No notice of them for public prayer, but only for private, in the three first ages, 542.—IX. What service was allotted to these canonical hours by the Church in the fourth century, 548.—X. Of the *matutina* or *prima*, called the *new morning service*, 550.—XI. Of the *tertia*, or *third hour of prayer*, 551.—XII. Of the sixth hour, or noonday service, 552.—XIII. Of the ninth hour, or three in the afternoon, 552.

CHAPTER X.

The order of their daily morning service.

SECT. I. The order of morning service, as described in the Constitutions. This began with the lxiii Psalm, 554.—II. What notice there is of this Morning Psalm in other writers, 555.—III. Next to the psalm followed the prayers for the catechumens, energumens, competents, and penitents, 556.—IV. Then the prayers for the faithful, the peace of the world, and the whole state of Christ's Church, 556.—V. What notice we have of these prayers in other writers, 557.—VI. After the general prayer for the whole state of the Church, followed a short bidding prayer for preservation in the ensuing day, 559.—VII. Then the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, 560.—VIII. And his imposition of hands or benediction, with the deacon's dismission of the assembly, 561.—IX. Whether the morning hymn was part of the public service every day, 561.—X. Whether the Psalms and Lessons were read at the daily morning service, 563.—XI. The original of the *ante-lucan* or *night assemblies* in time of persecution, 566.—XII. These continued when the persecutions were over, 567.—XIII. The order of divine service, which was performed in them, as described by St. Basil, 569.—XIV. The account of them out of Cassian, 570.—XV. This morning service much frequented by the laity as well as the clergy, 573.

CHAPTER XI.

The order of their daily evening service.

SECT. I. The evening service in most things conformed to that of the morning, 574.—II. But they differed, first, in that a proper Psalm, the cxlist, was appointed for the evening service. This Psalm called the Evening Psalm by the Author of the Constitutions, 574.—III. This Psalm mentioned by Chrysostom and other writers under the same denomination, 574.—IV. Secondly, they had proper prayers for the evening service, 575.—V. The evening hymn, 578.—VI. Whether there were any hymns, or psalms, or lessons read in the evening service, beside the cxlist Psalm, 580.—VII. The Lord's Prayer used in many churches, as the conclusion of the daily morning and evening service, 582.

THE ANTIQUITIES.

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary.

THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XI.

OF THE RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the several names and appellations of baptism in the Primitive Church.

1. THERE are a great many questions relating to the doctrine of baptism, which I intend not to make any part of the subject of this Book, because they may be found in any didactical and polemical writers upon this head, and especially in Vossius's elaborate discourse *De Baptismo*, where he accurately canvasses all questions of this nature, and learnedly determines them from the doctrine of the Ancients. Here the reader may find a satisfactory account of all questions relating to the mystical signification and spiritual effects of baptism; such as are, first, regeneration; secondly, adoption; thirdly, reception into the covenant of grace: in which also are contained remission of sins, renovation of the Spirit, and eternal life, which are the noble effects conferred on all those who rightly receive it. Here also he determines the questions,—How it comes to pass, that though sins are forgiven in baptism, yet

The names of baptism most commonly taken from the spiritual effects of it.

concupiscence, the fuel or incentive of sin, remains still in the regenerate? And whence it is, that after baptism we are still afflicted with diseases, and that as well infants as adult persons? How it comes to pass, that the magistrate has power to punish those sins which are committed before baptism, even after they are purged away and forgiven in baptism? With many other questions of the like nature, which are not necessary to come into this discourse.

I shall also omit the question about the indelible character of baptism, which is pretended to be impressed upon the soul; and the questions about the administrator of baptism, and lay-baptism, and heretical baptism, because I have lately, [in the years 1712 and 1714,] considered these distinctly and fully, in a first and second parts of the Scholastical History of Lay-baptism. What remains therefore to be considered in this place, is only such other matters in the practice of the ancient Church relating to the administration of baptism, as have not yet been spoken of.

And here, first of all, it will be proper to say something of the ancient names of baptism; some of which were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others from the nature and substance of the action; others from the conditions required in the receivers; others from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration.

Hence baptism called *indulgentia, indulgence*, or *absolution.*

2. From one of its noblest effects, it was sometimes styled *indulgentia, indulgence*, or *absolution and remission of sins.* Thus, in the African Council under Cyprian[1], Privatianus à Suffetula terms it, 'the divine indulgence.' And in the Roman Council, mentioned by Cotelerius[2], it is said, 'that at the Easter festival, remission of sins, (meaning baptism,) may be administered by either presbyter or deacon, in the presence of the bishop, in the parish-churches.' But forasmuch as absolution or remission of sins may not always necessarily accompany baptism, through some default in the administrator or the receiver, though the baptism be otherwise a true

[1] Ap. Cypr. n. 19. p. 234. (p. 161.) Si hæresis a Deo est, habere et indulgentiam divinam potest.

[2] C. 7. in Constit. Apost. l. 3. c. 9. (v. 1. p. 282.) Paschæ tempore presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsente episcopo.

baptism; therefore St. Austin[3], in disputing with the Donatists, chooses to call it 'the sacrament of grace,' and 'the sacrament of absolution,' rather than grace or absolution itself: because wicked men may receive the sacrament of baptism, but they cannot receive the grace of baptism, which is absolution or remission of sins; for God grants that to none but those that turn to him with a sincere faith and true repentance. Whenever therefore the Ancients call baptism by the name of *absolution* or *indulgence*, they are to be understood with this limitation, that it is so only to those who are worthy receivers of it. And hence we may observe, that the true ancient proper notion of an absolution or indulgence is God's pardoning sin by the ministerial application of his sacraments, which are the seals of his covenant, granting remission of sins: whence baptism, entering men into that covenant of grace, was dignified with the name of the *sacrament of absolution* or *indulgence.*

And παλιγγενεσία, *regeneration,* and χρίσμα, *the unction.*

3. Another noble effect of baptism was regeneration, or a new birth from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. For every Christian was supposed to be born again by the waters of baptism, according to that of Tertullian[4], '*Nos pisciculi secundum* 'ΙΧΘΥΝ *nostrum, Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur; We fishes are born in water, conformable to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,* 'ΙΧΘΥΣ. This, as I have observed in another place[5], was an acrostic or technical name, made of the initial letters of our Saviour's several titles in Greek, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ, which put together, make up the name 'ΙΧΘΥΣ, which signifies *a fish,* and is alluded to not only by Tertullian, but by Prosper[6] and Opta-

[3] De Bapt. l. 5. c. 21. (t. 9. p. 155 g.) Quapropter sacramentum gratiæ dat Deus etiam per malos; ipsam vero gratiam non nisi per seipsum vel per sanctos suos. Baptismum vero, quod est sacramentum remissionis peccatorum, quia nulli dubium est habere etiam homicidas posse, &c.

[4] De Bapt. c. 1. (p. 224 a.) Sed nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθὺν nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur.

[5] B. 1. ch. 1. s. 2. v. 1. p. 3.

[6] De Promiss. part. 2. c. 39. (append. p. 168 c. 6.) Qui tributum pro se et pro Petro, et cæcato lumen reddidit Paulo, satians ex se ipso in litore discipulos, et toti se offerens mundo ἰχθύν. Namque Latine *piscem* sacris literis majores nostri hoc interpretati sunt, ex Sibyllinis versibus colligentes, quod est *Iesus Christus, Filius Dei, Salvator,* piscis in sua passione decoctus, cujus ex interioribus remediis quotidie illuminamur et pascimur.

tus[7]. Hence baptism had the name of παλιγγενεσία ψυχῆς in Cyril's Catechism[8], *the regeneration of the soul;* and ὕδωρ ζωῆς, *the water of life,* in Justin Martyr[9]; and *fons divinus,* in Cassiodore[10], *the divine fountain,* whence comes our English name, *font;* with many other titles of the same importance. And because this new birth was wrought by the power and influence of the Spirit, therefore it was called *the spiritual birth,* whereby those who were born carnally to the world before, were now born spiritually to God: and so, as Optatus[11] words it, 'God was hereby made father of men, and the holy Church their mother.' For till men were baptized, they were not perfect members of Christ's body, the Church, nor properly adopted into God's family, and consequently had as yet no right to call God their father, or the Church their mother. And because the divine operations of the Holy Spirit in sanctifying grace are sometimes in Scripture called *the unction* or *anointing of the Spirit,* therefore baptism had also the name of *chrism* or *unction,* from this noble effect attending it. Gregory Nazianzen[12] takes notice of this among many other titles of honour: 'We call it,' says he, 'the *gift,* and *grace,* and *baptism,* and *unction,* and *illumination,* and *garment of immortality,* and *laver of regeneration,* and *seal* or *character,* and whatever else is precious or honourable.' And in explaining these terms, he particularly notes that it had the name of *unction,* 'because it was a sacred and a royal

[7] L. 3. p. 62. (p. 61.) Hic est *piscis,* qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut, quæ aqua fuerat, a pisce etiam *piscina* vocitetur. Cujus piscis nomen, secundum appellationem Græcam, in uno nomine per singulas literas, turbam sanctorum nominum continet, ΙΧΘΥΣ, quod est Latine Iesus Christus, Dei Filius, Salvator.

[8] Præfat. n. 10. [al. 16.] (p. 12 a.) Μέγα τὸ προκείμενον βάπτισμα· αἰχμαλώτοις λύτρον· ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσις· θάνατος ἁμαρτίας· παλιγγενεσία ψυχῆς, κ. τ. λ.

[9] Dialog. c. Tryph. (p. 231 c.) Διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ οὖν τῆς μετανοίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνομίας τῶν λαῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονεν, ὡς Ἡσαΐας βοᾷ, ἡμεῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν, καὶ γνωρίζομεν, ὅτι τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο, ὃ προηγόρευε τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μόνον καθαρίσαι τοὺς μετανοήσαντας δυνάμενον, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς.

[10] In Cantic. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 501.) Potest etiam per *ventrem* ecclesiæ divinus fons baptismatis accipi, quo fideles in novam creaturam regenerantur.

[11] L. 2. p. 52. (p. 44.) .... Dum Trinitas cum fide concordat, qui natus fuerat sæculo, renascatur spiritaliter Deo. Sic fit hominum pater Deus, sancta sic fit mater Ecclesia.

[12] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 638 d.) Δῶρον καλοῦμεν, χάρισμα, βάπτισμα, χρίσμα, φώτισμα, ἀφθαρσίας ἔνδυμα, λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, σφραγῖδα, πᾶν ὅτι τίμιον.

thing, as those things usually were that were anointed.' Whence every man was in some sense made a king and a priest to God by Christ in his baptism; upon which account St. Jerom[13] styles baptism, *sacerdotium laici, the layman's priesthood*, in contradistinction to the clerical priesthood, which was only conferred by ordination.

4. Another effect of baptism was the enlightening men's understandings with divine knowledge. Hence baptism had the name of *φωτισμὸς, illumination*, as it frequently occurs in Chrysostom[14], Nazianzen[15], Dionysius the Areopagite[16], the Council of Laodicea[17], and many others. The reason of which name seems to be partly from the preceding instruction of the catechumens in their preparation for baptism, according to that of Justin Martyr[18], 'this laver is called *illumination*, because the minds of those, who learn these things, are enlightened.' Then again, because it was the entrance on an enlightened state, and the introduction to divine knowledge, which grew by degrees to greater perfection: for Justin's words may be understood of the knowledge consequent to baptism. And so the reason is given by Clemens Alexandrinus[19], and the author under the name of Dionysius[20], 'because it confers the first light, and is the introduction to all other divine illuminating mysteries, therefore from the effect it was dignified with the name of *illumination*.'

Φωτισμὸς, illumination.

Perhaps it might be so called in regard also that the bap-

[13] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 2. [al. 4.] (t. 2. p. 174 a.) ... Sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma. Scriptum est enim, Regnum quippe nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Et iterum, Gentem sanctam, regale sacerdotium, &c.

[14] Hom. 13. in Hebr. p. 1848. (t. 12. p. 135 d.) Πολλοὺς οἶδα τοῦτο παθόντας ἐγὼ, οἳ προσδοκίᾳ μὲν τοῦ φωτίσματος πολλὰ ἡμάρτανον· πρὸς δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς τελευτῆς ἀπῆλθον κενοί· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦτο τὸ βάπτισμα ἔδωκεν, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, οὐχ ἵνα αὐξήσῃ [τὰς ἁμαρτίας].

[15] Orat. 40. de Bapt. See n. 12, preceding.

[16] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 3. part. 1. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 187 b.) .... Τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς θεογενεσίας τελετὴν, ἐπειδὴ πρώτου φωτὸς μεταδίδωσι καὶ πασῶν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῶν θείων φωταγωγιῶν, ἐκ τοῦ τελουμένου τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ φωτίσματος ἐπωνυμίαν ὑμνοῦμεν.

[17] C. 47. (t. 1. p. 1505 a.) Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβάνοντας τὸ φώτισμα, καὶ εἶτα ἀναστάντας, ἐκμανθάνειν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ γινώσκειν, ὅτι θείας δωρεᾶς κατηξιώθησαν.

[18] Apol. 2. (p. 94 d.) Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων.

[19] Pædag. l. 1. c. 6. p. 93. (p. 113. 27.) Καλεῖται δὲ πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο χάρισμα, καὶ φώτισμα, καὶ τέλειον, καὶ λουτρόν'.... φώτισμα δὲ, δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς τὸ σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται, τουτέστιν δι' οὗ τὸ θεῖον ὀξυωποῦμεν.

[20] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 3. See n. 16, preceding.

tized were now admitted to all the mysterious parts and recondite knowledge of religion, which by the discipline of the Church were kept secret from them whilst they were catechumens. And perhaps some regard might be had to the plentiful effusion of the Spirit in the gift of tongues, knowledge, and prophecy, which in the apostolical age was immediately conferred at baptism, by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles[21].

And *salus, salvation.*

5. Another effect of baptism was eternal salvation, as it was the ordinary means, not only of obtaining remission of sins, but of bringing men by the grace and blood of Christ to the glory of the kingdom of heaven. Whence, as St. Austin[22] observes, it was very common among the Punic, or African Christians, to call baptism by the name of *salus, salvation;* as they did the sacrament of the body of Christ by the name of *life*, because these two sacraments were reputed necessary to the obtaining of salvation or eternal life. And upon this account Gregory Nazianzen[23], introducing a person pleading for liberty to delay his baptism, makes him speak after this manner,—'I stay only for my father, or mother, or brother, or wife, or children, or friends, or some near relations, and then I will be saved,—*τηνικαῦτα σωθήσομαι*,'—the meaning of which must needs be, that then he would be baptized, in order to obtain salvation. Such honourable titles and appellations did the Ancients give to this sacrament of baptism, taken from the noble effects which it was supposed to confer on all those who were worthy partakers of it.

From the nature and substance of it, it was called *mysterium, sacramentum,*

6. Next, from the nature and substance of it, it had the names of *mysterium*, *sacramentum*, and *σφραγίς*. The two first of which are so common, and so well known to every reader, that I need not here spend time to explain them. Only I shall note, that the terms, *mystery* and *sacrament*, are some-

[21] [Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 51. al. Serm. 1. de Utilit. Lect. Script. t. 5. p. 680. (t. 3. p. 76 a.).... 'Ο δὲ ἀπόστολος καὶ προφήτης ἐστὶ πάντως, καὶ χαρίσματα ἔχει ἰαμάτων, καὶ γένη γλωσσῶν, καὶ ἑρμηνείας γλωσσῶν. κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[22] De Peccat. Merit. l. 1. c. 24. t. 7. p. 294. (t. 10. p. 19 e.) Optime Punici Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam *salutem*, et sacramentum corporis Christi, nihil aliud quam *vitam* vocant, &c.

[23] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 655 b.) 'Απελθὼν ἐπανάηκε, καὶ αὔριον βαστισθήσομαι· παρέστω μοι μήτηρ, παρέστω μοι πατὴρ, ἀδελφοὶ, γυνὴ, τέκνα, φίλοι, πᾶν ὅ, τι μοι τίμιον, καὶ τηνικαῦτα σωθήσομαι.

times taken in a larger sense, to signify any sacred ceremony, or any part of religion that had any thing of spiritual or mystical signification in it: of which there will be a more proper place to discourse, when we come to treat of confirmation. and σφραγίς.

The name σφραγίς, and *signaculum, the seal* of the Lord, is a little more uncommon, as applied to baptism, and therefore has occasioned some errors among learned men, who often mistake it, either for the sign of the cross, or the consignation and unction that was used in confirmation. Thus in that famous discourse of Clemens Alexandrinus, intituled *Quis Dives Salvetur?* part of which is recorded in Eusebius[24], and the whole published by Combefis[25], it is said that the bishop, to whose care St. John had committed a certain young convert, first instructed or catechized him, and then gave him the perfect phylactery or preservative against sin, namely, *the seal of the Lord,*—*τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου.* Now by *the seal of the Lord,* Christophorson, and Bellarmin, and others from him, understand *confirmation.* Mr. Seller[26], and some others, will have it to be *the sign of the cross;* but Valesius[27] and Daille[28]

[24] L. 3. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 113. 17.) Ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος ἀναλαβὼν οἴκαδε τὸν παραδοθέντα νεανίσκον, ἔτρεφε, συνεῖχεν, ἔθαλπε, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἐφώτισε· καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὑφῆκε τῆς πλείονος ἐπιμελείας καὶ παραφυλακῆς, ὡς τὸ τέλειον αὐτῷ φυλακτήριον ἐπιστήσας, τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου.

[25] Auctar. Noviss. p. 185. (ap. Oper. Clement. ed. Oxon. 1715. pp. 935, seqq.)

[26] Life of Just. Martyr. (Remarques, &c. p. 102.) Hence it was called by Tertullian *signaculum frontium, &c.*

[27] Not. in Euseb. l. 3. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 113. n. 4.) Veteres Christiani ita baptismum vocabant, σφραγῖδα, ut præter cæteros docet Gregorius Nazianzenus. [See n. 12, preceding.] Causam vero cur baptismum vocarent σφραγῖδα, idem Gregorius subjungit, quod scilicet baptismus sit conservatio et dominii nota. Male ergo Christophorsonus hunc Eusebii nostri locum de sacramento confirmationis interpretatus est, &c.

[28] De Confirmat. l. 2. c. 1. (p. 110.) *Aperte,* inquit [Bellarminus], *loquitur Clemens de sacramento confirmationis.* Fateor, inquam, si verum, ac vere a Domino institutum, confirmationis sacramentum intelligis; baptismum nimirum, quod verbo ἐφώτισε, Græcis in ea re familiari, expressit: sin de tua chrismatione capis, ut certe capis, nihil de ea Clemens; nedum ut aperte de eo loquutus sit. *At,* inquit, *id, de quo loquitur, et quo velut perfecta custodia munitum adolescentem narrat, id, τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου, Domini sigillum, vel signaculum, vocat.* Fateor; sed eo nomine Christi baptismum, quem ab adolescente susceptum dixerat, intelligi aio; tuam chrismationem, de qua verbum nullum fecerat, intelligi nego. Nimirum bonus ille presbyter, adolescente semel tincto atque initiato, putavit, non esse posthac sibi diligentius in eo custodiendo laborandum; quod in hoc sanctissimo, quo Domino Christo consecratus, et ab eo consignatus erat, mysterio satis ipsi præsidii ad omnem hostium vim amoliendam datum esse existimaret. Sic intellexit Ruffinus: *Post hæc,*

more truly expound it of *baptism*, which was called *the seal of the Lord*, because in the very nature of it there is contained a covenant made between God and man; and baptism being the seal of this covenant, it was with the greatest propriety of speech styled *the seal of the Lord*. In this sense the ancient author of the Acts of Paul and Thecla uses the name σφραγίς, for *baptism*. 'Give me,' says Thecla to St. Paul[29], 'the seal of Christ, and no temptation shall touch me.' And Hermes Pastor[30], in like manner, speaking of some that were baptized and gone to heaven, uses the same dialect: 'They that are now dead were sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and are entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is consigned over to death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death, and consigned over to life. Now that seal is water, into which men descend bound over to death, but rise out of it, marked out or sealed unto life. This seal therefore was preached unto them, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God.' In all this passage there is no express mention made of baptism, but it is called *the seal and name of Christ*, because it sets the mark and name of Christians on us, and

inquit, *velut confidens gratiæ, qua fuerat communitus, paullo indulgentius juvenem habere cœpit.* Cuinam gratiæ confidebat? *Qua*, inquit, *fuerat communitus.* Fuisse autem communitum non chrismate, quod hic nullum apparet, sed baptismo dixerat. Quin immo, ut id significaret Ruffinus, non baptismum, sed baptismi gratiam dixerat. *Ad ultimum*, inquit, *baptismi gratiam tradit;* ut quod addit continenter, *Post hæc jam velut confidens gratiæ*, non de alia, quam de baptismi gratia, possit intelligi. Et sane baptismus Domini σφραγὶς, *sigillum*, vel *signaculum* multo rectius, quam *chrisma* dicitur. Illum enim a Domino institutum ad oves suas obsignandas patet ex omnibus evangeliis; de hoc nihil tale uspiam legitur. Baptismo vero signaculi sive sigilli nomen convenire, et Paulus satis docet, et vetus Ecclesia loquitur. Paulus quidem, qui cum circumcisionem, qua Mosaicæ legi vetus initiabatur populus, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως, *signaculum justitiæ fidei* vocat; quanto magis id nominis dandum putaverit baptismo; quo Dominico evangelio initiatur novus populus? Ecclesia vetus, hanc Pauli auctoritatem et nomenclaturam sequuta, baptismum signaculum vocat, &c.

[29] Acta Theclæ, ap. Grab. Spicileg. (t. 1. p. 106.) Δός μοι τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγίδα, καὶ οὐχ ἅψεταί μου πειρασμός.

[30] L. 3. Simil. 9. n. 16. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 117.) Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est; at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur a morte, et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo ut intrarent in regnum Dei.

distinguishes us from Jews and Gentiles, and shows that we belong to the dominion and possession of Christ. Hence Tertullian frequently calls it[31] *signaculum fidei, the signature of our faith:* and says we are distinguished from Jews by this signature in our bodies[32], because their signature was circumcision, but ours baptism. In like manner, Gregory Nazianzen[33], accounting for the reason of this name, says it was called *the seal of the Lord,* 'because it was an indication to whose dominion we belong, and because it was the consignation of us to eternal life.' In which respect, Constantine at the hour of death, desiring the benefit of baptism from the bishops that were about him, is said by Eusebius[34] to ask it in these words; 'Now is the time for me to enjoy the seal of immortality; now is the time for me to obtain the seal of salvation.' Whence it was also called *the seal of the Spirit,* because every worthy receiver was supposed, together with the outer element, to receive the earnest of the Spirit in baptism: according to that of Chrysostom[35], 'as a mark is set upon soldiers, so the Spirit is put upon true believers.' And as the Jews had circumcision for their character, so we have the earnest of the Spirit. And this distinction between the internal and external seal of baptism was necessary to be made, because many men received the external seal of baptism, or the outward form of it, who by their own default could not receive the internal seal of the Spirit. Thus the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[36] observes, 'that even Simon Magus himself received the

[31] De Spectacul. c. 4. (p. 74 c.) ... Ad principalem auctoritatem convertar, ipsius signaculi nostri [al. nomen].—Ibid. c. 24. (p. 83 a.).... Hoc erit pompa diaboli, adversus quam in signaculo fidei ejeramus.

[32] Apolog. c. 21. (p. 19 a.)...Neque de ipso signaculo corporis, neque de consortio nominis cum Judæis agimus.

[33] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 639 a.) *Σφραγίδα δὲ ὡς συντήρησιν καὶ τῆς δεσποτείας σημείωσιν.*

[34] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 62. (v. 1. p. 662. 7.) *Ὥρα καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀπολαῦσαι τῆς ἀθανατοποιοῦ σφραγίδος, ὥρα τοῦ σωτηρίου σφραγίσματος μετασχεῖν.*

[35] Hom. 3. in 2 Cor. in fine. (t. 10. p. 454 b. 4.) *Κάθαπερ στρατιώταις σφραγὶς, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς πιστοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐπιτίθεται, κ. τ. λ.*

[36] L. 2. c. 14. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 222.) ....*Ἔλαβεν.. καὶ Σίμων ὁ μάγος τὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ σφραγίδα.*—Vid. August. de Bapt. l. 6. c. 12. (t. 9. p. 168 f. et p. 169 a.) Aliud est enim, Omnis, qui intrabit in regnum cœlorum, prius renascitur ex aqua et Spiritu; quia nisi renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum: quod Dominus dixit et verum est. Aliud autem, Omnis, qui nascitur ex aqua et Spiritu, intrabit in regnum cœlorum: quod utique falsum est. Nam et Simon, ille magus, natus erat ex aqua et Spiritu, et tamen non intravit in regnum cœlorum.

seal of the Lord,' meaning the outward form of baptism; but neither he nor any other author ever said that he received the internal seal or grace of the Holy Spirit. In like manner Optatus[37] tells the Donatists, 'that both they and the Catholics were sealed with one and the same seal,' which he explains to be the outward form of baptism, in which they both agreed and were both alike baptized. But both Optatus and St. Austin, and all other ancient writers, are agreed that heretical and schismatical baptism, such as was that of the Donatists, could not confer the internal seal, or sanctifying graces of the Holy Spirit, because these were only conferred by the ministry of the holy Catholic Church, of which I have given a more ample account in another place[38]. So that in this respect it was always thought necessary to distinguish between the internal and external seal of baptism, because though they are commonly joined together, as in all true believers, yet they are sometimes separated, as in such hypocritical or unworthy receivers as Simon Magus, and others of the like complexion.

And character dominicus, the mark or character of the Lord.

7. St. Austin commonly uses the name, *character regius*, and, *character dominicus, the royal mark*, or *character*, and *the character of the Lord.* By which he does not mean any internal quality, or spiritual power, distinct from baptism, imprinted on the soul, as the modern Schoolmen now love to word it; but only the external form of baptism, which is common to all receivers both good and bad, who are duly baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity: they are so far signed by the mark or character of the Lord, as thereby to be distinguished from unbaptized Jews and Gentiles, who never made any formal profession of Christianity, nor ever received so much as the external character or indication of it. And this character is allowed by St. Austin to be so far indelible also, as that an apostatizing Christian, though he turn Jew or Pagan in profession, can never need a second baptism, but only repentance and absolution, to reinstate him in all the privileges of the Christian Church. Of which, because I have spoken largely in a former Book[39], I need say no more in this place.

[37] L. 3. p. 72. (p. 78.).... Pares credimus, et uno sigillo signati sumus: nec aliter baptizati quam vos.

[38] Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, part 1. ch. 1. s. 21.

[39] Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism,

8. Another sort of names given to baptism, were taken from the conditions required of all those that received it, which were the profession of a true faith and a sincere repentance. Upon which account baptism is sometimes called *the sacrament of faith*, and *the sacrament of repentance*. St. Austin[40] uses this name to explain how children may be said to have faith, though they are not capable of making any formal profession by themselves: 'As the sacrament of the body of Christ is in some sort the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith. And upon this account, when the answer is made, that an infant believes, who has not yet the habit of faith, the meaning is, that he has faith because of the sacrament of faith, and that he turns to God because of the sacrament of conversion.' Fulgentius[41] uses the same terms in speaking of the necessity of baptism: 'Firmly believe and doubt not, that excepting such as are baptized in their own blood for the name of Christ, no man shall have eternal life, who is not here first turned from his sins by repentance and faith, and set at liberty by the sacrament of faith and repentance, that is, by baptism.' Whence we may observe what the Ancients mean, when they speak of penance and absolution, or remission of sins, as a sacrament: for they themselves explain their own meaning to be *baptism*, which is a sacrament requiring repentance as a condition, and granting absolution as an effect and privilege to all worthy receivers.

Why called *the sacrament of faith and repentance.*

9. Lastly, from the ceremonies used in the act of administration it took the peculiar names of *baptism*, *tinction* and *laver of regeneration*, which properly denote either an immersion in water, or such a washing or sprinkling as was used among the Jews in some cases, and among Christians, when they had occasion to baptize sick persons upon a death-bed.

The notation of the names, *baptism*, *tinction*, *laver*, &c., that they do not universally denote immersion.

part. 2. ch. 6. [first published in 1714, one year before the appearance of this portion of the present work. Ed.]

[40] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 267 f.) Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, et sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est... Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui nondum fidei habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, &c.

[41] De Fid. ad Petr. c. 30. See before, b. 10. ch. 2. s. 20. v. 3. p. 480. n. 53.

For then baptism was administered by sprinkling only, and not by dipping or immersion, as we shall see when we come to speak more particularly of clinic baptism. So that it must be noted, that baptism in the ancient style of the Church, does not absolutely and necessarily import dipping or immersion, though that was the more usual ceremony practised heretofore as well upon infants as adult persons, but an exception was made for the time of sickness, and such other cases of necessity, as could not admit of a total immersion. In which cases, the substance of baptism was still supposed to be preserved, though some minuter circumstances were less regarded.

Of some other names given to baptism.

10. Besides these names, which were taken from things that more immediately related to the administration of baptism, there were some others alluding to circumcision, and others respecting the great author and institutor of it, our Saviour Christ, and others taken from the more remote and distant effects of it; which, because we shall have no further occasion to speak of them, it will not be improper to mention in this place.

Because baptism succeeds in the room of circumcision, and is the seal of the Christian covenant, as that was the seal of the covenant made with Abraham, therefore it is by way of analogy sometimes styled *the great circumcision.* As when Epiphanius[42], comparing them both together, says, 'the carnal circumcision served for a time, till the great circumcision came, that is, baptism; which circumcises us from our sins, and seals us in the name of God.'

So in regard that baptism had Christ for its author and not man, it was anciently known by the name of δῶρον, and χάρισμα Κυρίου, *the gift of the Lord.* As in the ancient Acts of Paul and Thecla; when Thecla desired the seal of the Lord, Paul bids her wait with patience, and she should receive δωρεὰν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the gift of Christ,* which, as the learned editor[43] observes, is but another way of denoting

[42] Hær. 28. Cerinth. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 112 d.) Διήρκεσε δὲ ἡ περιτομὴ χρόνῳ ὑπηρετήσασα, ἕως ἡ μείζων περιτομὴ παρεγένετο, τουτέστι τὸ λουτρὸν τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, κ. τ. λ.— Cf. Just. Mart. Dialog. cum Tryph. (p. 261 d.) Ἡμεῖς, οἱ διὰ τούτου [Χριστοῦ] προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ, διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὰν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόνειμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάβομεν, κ. τ. λ.

[43] Grabe, Spicileg. (t. 1. p. 106.) Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος τῇ Θέκλᾳ· Μακροθύμησον, καὶ λήψῃ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ

baptism. Sometimes it was simply called δῶρον, without any other addition, by way of eminence, because it was both a gratuitous and a singular *gift* of Christ. 'We call it *the gift,*' says Gregory Nazianzen[44], 'because it is given to those who offer nothing for it.' And St. Basil[45], 'Δέον ἐπιτρέχειν τῷ δώρῳ, *We ought to run to the gift,*' meaning baptism. And Casaubon[46] has also further observed, that because the Spirit was likewise given in baptism, therefore the Holy Ghost had sometimes the name of *munus, the gift.* And the eucharist also, or the sacramental oblation of the body and blood of Christ, both before and after consecration, commonly went by this name, δῶρα and μύστικα δῶρα, of which there are various instances collected out of the ancient Rituals by that learned writer, which are not proper to be inserted in this place.

Baptism had also the name of ἐφόδιον, or *viaticum,* as well as the eucharist, which denotes properly *the preparation of all things necessary for a journey:* in which respect both the sacraments were called *viatica,* because they were equally esteemed men's necessary provision and proper armour both to sustain and conduct them safe on their way in their passage through this world to eternal life. St. Basil, exhorting men of all ages and conditions to receive baptism, makes his address to them in these words[47]: 'Art thou a young man? then secure thy youth by the bridle of baptism. Art thou past the flower of thy age? then beware thou lose not thy *viaticum,* thy phylactery, which should keep and preserve thee in thy way to eternal life.' In allusion to which name, Gregory Nazianzen[48], speaking of the minister's act in baptizing, terms it ἐφοδιάζειν, *giving to men their viaticum,* or *provision for their journey to another world.*

In reference to its making men complete members of Christ's

Χριστοῦ.—In quem loc. (ibid. p. 333.) Hac voce sacramentum baptismi denotatur.

44 Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 638 d.) ... Δῶρον [καλοῦμεν,] ὡς καὶ μηδὲν προσενεγκοῦσι διδόμενον.

45 Hom. 13. de Bapt. p. 411. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 162 a. n. 3.)

46 Exercit. 16. in Baron. n. 51. (p. 414. c. 1.) Quin etiam ipse Spir tus Sanctus, unicus tanti mysterii effector, appellatur donum et munus κυρίως, hoc est, *proprie.*

47 De Bapt. p. 413. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 163 c. n. 5.) Μὴ ζημιωθῇς τὰ ἐφόδια, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς τὸ φυλακτήριον.

48 Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1 p. 644 b.) ... Ἕως οὐ μάχῃ βαπτιστοῦ καὶ χρηματιστοῦ, τοῦ μὲν ὅπως ἐφοδιάσῃ φιλονεικοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ ὅπως γραφῇ κληρονόμος.

body, the Church, it had the name of τελείωσις and τελετὴ, *the consecration* and *consummation;* because it gave men the perfection of Christians, and a right to partake of the τὸ τέλειον, which was the eucharist, or the Lord's supper.

It had the name of μύησις, and μυσταγωγία, *the initiation,* because it was the admittance of men to all the sacred rites and mysteries of the Christian religion. And as the eucharist, from its representing the death of Christ by the outward elements of bread and wine, was called the sacred symbols, so baptism sometimes had the same name, as we find in Isidore of Pelusium, and the author of the dispute with Arius in the Council of Nice, under the name of Athanasius. 'Though the priest be an ill liver,' says Isidore[49], 'the person initiated receives no harm by the symbols of salvation, but only the priest himself.' And the other[50] thus argues for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost: 'If the Holy Spirit be not of the substance of the Father and the Son, why then did the Son of God join him together with them in the symbol of sanctification, when he said to his disciples, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."' In both which places, it is plain, *the symbols of sanctification and salvation* can mean no other than baptism.

And hence it appears, that the same honourable titles were given to the waters of baptism, as to the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's supper; and whatever change was supposed to be wrought in the one by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, was equally ascribed to the other also; and as noble effects derived from the font as from the Lord's table, whilst the death of Christ was equally represented, and the benefits of it alike communicated to all worthy receivers in baptism and the Lord's supper. For which reason I have been a little the more curious in examining and explaining the several

[49] L. 2. Ep. 37. (p. 137 c.) ... Ὁ τελούμενος οὐδὲν παραβλάπτεται εἰς τὰ σωτηριωδῆ σύμβολα, εἰ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ εὖ βιοὺς εἴη, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μὲν πάντως (χρὴ γὰρ διαβεβαιώσασθαι) ἀπολαύσει τῶν θείων ἐκείνων καὶ λόγου κρειττόνων εὐεργεσιῶν.

[50] Athanas. Disp. cont. Arium, in C. Nicæn. t. 1. p. 141. (t. 2. p. 176 e. n. 38.) Εἰ οὖν οὐκ ἔστι τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ οὐσίας τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τίνος ἕνεκεν συνηρίθμησεν αὐτὸ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ; φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, Πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε, κ. τ. λ.

titles of honour which the Ancients gave to baptism, that under these eminent characters we might see what apprehensions and ideas the Church of Christ always had of this venerable mystery, which some now by way of contempt call *water-baptism*, as if the Spirit had no concern in it; whose doctrines may easily be perceived not to proceed from the general sense of the ancient Catholic Church, but from particular sects and heresies broken off from it, of which it will not be amiss to give a short account in the following chapter.

CHAP. II.

Of the matter of baptism, with an account of such heretics as rejected or corrupted baptism by water.

Baptism wholly rejected by the heretics called Ascodrutæ, and Marcosians, and Valentinians, and Quintillians.

1. Though the Church always maintained an honourable opinion of baptism, as a divine and heavenly institution, yet there wanted not sects and heresies, who in the earliest ages spake very diminutively and contemptibly of it; and either in whole or in part upon various reasons rejected or corrupted it. The Ascodrutæ, who were a sort of Gnostics, placed all religion in knowledge, and under pretence of spiritual worship, would admit of no external or corporeal symbols whatsoever. They asserted, as Theodoret[51] describes them, 'that divine mysteries, being the images of invisible things, were not to be performed by visible things; nor incorporeal things by sensible and corporeal things.' Therefore they never baptized any that were of their sect, nor celebrated any part of the mystery of baptism among them: for they said, the knowledge of all things was their redemption. Irenæus[52] and Epiphanius observe the same thing to be practised, upon the same principle of spiritual redemption by knowledge alone, among some of those who were called Marcosian heretics;

[51] Hæret. Fabul. l. 1. c. 10. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 302.) Οὗτοι δέ φασιν, μὴ χρῆναι τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια, ἀοράτων ὄντα σύμβολα, δι' ὁρωμένων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι πραγμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἀσώματα δι' αἰσθητῶν καὶ σωματικῶν' ... διὰ τοῦτο, οὔτε βαπτίζουσι τοὺς προσίοντας, οὐδὲ ἐπιτελεῖται παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸ μυστήριον' λύτρωσιν γὰρ καλοῦσι, τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἐπίγνωσιν.

[52] L. 1. c. 18. nn. a, b, tot. (pp. 88, 89.) Τὴν δὲ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως αὐτοῖς παράδοσιν συμβέβηκεν ἀόρατον εἶναι καὶ ἀκατάληπτον' κ. τ. λ. [Conf. Epiphan. Hær. 34. n. 19. (t. 1. p. 254 a.) Ubi eadem ut apud Irenæum. Ed.]

whilst others of them, who retained a sort of baptism, invented strange forms of their own to corrupt it, of which I shall give an account in the eighth section of the following chapter. Irenæus[53] gives a like account of the Valentinians, some of whom wholly rejected baptism, and others corrupted it with strange forms of their own inventing, as the Marcosians did, who seem to have been branches of the same heresy under different leaders. Tertullian[54] brings a like charge against one Quintilla, a woman-preacher at Carthage, a little before his time, who set up to decry water-baptism as useless; pleading, that faith alone was sufficient to save men, as it did Abraham, who pleased God without any other sacrament, but the sacrament of faith. Against this heresy Tertullian wrote his Book of Baptism, to establish the necessity of it from our Saviour's institution, and to answer the little sophisms, whereby the libertines of this new sect pretended to destroy it.

And by the Archontici.

2. The Archontici rejected baptism for another reason, as Epiphanius[55] and Theodoret[56] inform us. They had entertained a very monstrous and blasphemous opinion, that the world was not created by the Supreme God of all things, but by certain powers, whom they called ἄρχοντες, *rulers*, whence they themselves had the denomination of *Archontici:* these rulers, seven or eight in number, they imagined to be in so many several orbs of the heavens, one above another, with orders of angels and ministries under them; and to the chief of these they gave the name of *Sabaoth.* Now they also pretended that baptism was only administered in the name of Sabaoth, and not in the name of the Supreme God, and therefore they rejected both it and the eucharist as foreign

[53] L. 3. c. 2. (pp. 199, 200.) [The words, *Evenit itaque neque Scripturis jam neque traditioni consentire eos*, occur; but the chapter contains no allusion to the rejection of baptism.—But see l. 1. c. 18. n. 1. (p. 88. 20.) Καὶ ὅτι μὲν εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[54] De Bapt. c. 1. (p. 224 a.) Nuper conversata istic quædam de Caiana hæresi vipera venenatissima, doctrina sua plerosque rapuit, imprimis baptismum destruens, &c.—Ibid. c. 13. (p. 229 c.) Adeo dicunt, Baptismus non est necessarius, quibus fides satis est, &c.

[55] Hær. 40. Archontic. n. 2, tot. (t. 1. p. 292, and especially at c.) Ὀγδοάδα τινὰ λέγουσιν εἶναι οὐρανὸν, καὶ ἑβδομάδα· εἰδέναι [? εἶναι] δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον οὐρανὸν ἄρχοντας, κ. τ. λ.

[56] Hæret. Fabul. l. 1. c. 11, tot. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 303.) Ἐκ δὲ τούτων, κ. τ. λ.

institutions, given by Sabaoth, the god of the Jews and the giver of the Law, whom they blasphemously distinguished from the Supreme God.

3. The Seleucians and Hermians refused the use of baptism by water, as St. Austin[57] describes them. And the ground of their refusal, was a pretence, that baptism by water was not the baptism instituted by Christ; because St. John Baptist, comparing his own baptism with the baptism of Christ, says, "I baptize you with water, but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire:" they thought the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit[58], and therefore a baptism by fire was more suitable to their nature. But what kind of baptism that was, none of the Ancients have told us: unless perhaps we may conjecture from what Clemens Alexandrinus[59] tells us out of Heracleon[60] of some, who when they

And by the Seleucians and Hermians.

[57] De Hæres. c. 59. (t. 8. p. 20 d.) Seleuciani et Hermiani .... baptismum in aqua non accipiunt.

[58] Vid. Philastr. de Hæres. c. 8. [al. 27.] (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 489 b.) Seleucus et Hermius hæretici, animas hominum de igne et spiritu esse existimantes [al. æstimantes], isto baptismo non utuntur propter verbum hoc quod dixit Iohannes Baptista; *Ipse vos baptizabit in Spiritu et igne.*

[59] Electa ex Scripturis, ap. Combefis. Auctar. Noviss. part. 1. p. 2026. 5. (Oper. Clem. p. 995. 16.) Ἔνιοι δὲ, ὥς φησιν Ἡρακλέων, πυρὶ τὰ ὦτα τῶν σφραγιζομένων κατεσημήναντο, κ. τ. λ. [Pluraliter legendum videtur κατεσημήναντο, ut feratur ad ἔνιοι, nec enim vel ad Christum, vel ad Heracleonem referri verisimile videtur. *Sylburg.*—Conf. ap. Grab. Spicileg., (part. 2. p. 85.) ubi eadem verba leguntur ..... Κατασημήναντο, οὕτως ἀκούσαντες τὸ ἀποστολικόν. Ed.] Irenæus, l. 1. c. 24., (p. 101. 29.) has something like this of the Carpocratians: Alii vero ex ipsis signant cauteriantes suos discipulos in posterioribus partibus exstantiæ dextræ auris. [See also Grabe's Spicilegium Hæreticorum, Sæc. 2. (t. 2. p. 85.) Ἔνιοι δὲ, ὥς φησιν Ἡρακλέων, πυρὶ τὰ ὦτα τῶν σφραγιζομένων κατεσημήναντο, οὕτως ἀκούσαντες τὸ ἀποστολικόν. This I have no doubt is the place my learned ancestor had in mind. On the last clause Grabe observes, Præcesserat nempe ante hæc verba (*ex Eclogis Propheticis Clementis Alex. &c.*) versus 61., et paulo post allegatur versus 17. capitis 3. Lucæ, in quem locum commentans Heracleon hæc mihi protulisse videtur. . . . Ὁ βαπτίσων ὑμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ πυρί· which is the last clause of Luke 3, 16.—The inquisitive reader may see more on the subject of *the use of fire in baptism by certain heretics* in Grabe's Annotation (t. 2. p. 235.) on the word κατασημήναντο. Quinam ante vel circa Heracleonis tempora aures neophytorum igne signarint, me prorsus fugit. Post ipsos vero Seleuciani sive Hermiani non aqua, sed igne in baptismi sacramento usi sunt, ut colligitur ex Philastrio, &c. Ed.]

[60] [He was the leader of a branch of the Valentinians, in the first quarter of the second century. The Fragments of his Commentaries on the Gospels according to St. Luke and St. John are published in Grabe's Spicilegium (part. 2. pp. 83, seqq.) as culled from the fourth book of

had baptized men in water, also made a mark upon their ears with fire: so joining water-baptism, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire, together. Though this was far enough from the fiery baptism St. John speaks of, which some of the Ancients understand of the ordinary operations of the Spirit, which consumes our sins; and others, of that extraordinary effusion of the Spirit in the form of fiery tongues upon the Apostles at the day of Pentecost: and others of the fire of the last judgment. A particular account of which interpretation the reader that is curious may find in Suicerus[60] upon this subject. I only note further out of the anonymous writer about heretical baptism, published by Rigaltius and Bp. Fell at the end of St. Cyprian, that there were a sort of heretics, who pretended, that baptism by water alone was of itself imperfect, because St. John had said, we were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Therefore they boasted[61], 'that theirs was the only complete and perfect baptism, and all others curtailed, and given only by halves, because when they went down into the water to baptize, either by some curious art in philosophy, like that of Anaxilaus, or by some magical art, they made fire to appear upon the surface of the water, and this they called baptism by fire.' Which they confirmed from an apocryphal writing of their own inventing, called the preaching of Peter or Paul, wherein it was said, that when Christ was baptized, fire so appeared upon the water. The censure which this author passes upon this kind of baptism, is, that it is adulterate, pernicious, and wholly evacuating the true baptism of Christ.

And by the Manichees

4. Another sect which rejected water-baptism were the Ma-

the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus and from the works of Origen. See the preceding note. Ed.]

[60] Thes. Eccles. (t. 1. p. 630 b.) Alii intelligunt ignem extremi judicii, &c.

[61] Anonym. de Baptismo Hæreticorum, ad calc. Cypr. p. 30. (p. 27.) ....Tentant nonnulli iterum tractare se solos integrum atque perfectum, non, sicuti nos, mutilatum et decurtatum baptisma tradere. Quod taliter dicantur assignare, ut, quam mox in aquam descenderunt, statim super aquam ignis appareat. Quod si aliquo lusu perpetrari potest, sicut affirmantur plerique hujusmodi lusus Anaxilai esse, sive naturale quid est, quo pacto possit hoc contingere, sive illi putant hoc se conspicere, sive Maligni opus et magicum virus ignem potest in aqua exprimere; illi tamen fallaciam et stropham prædicant perfectum baptisma esse, quod fideles homines si coacti fuerunt accipere, utique non dubitabitur eos id, quod habuerant, amisisse.

nichees, who, among many other prodigious errors, maintained that baptizing in water was of no efficacy to salvation, and therefore they despised it, and never baptized any that entered into their society, as St. Austin[62] and the author of the Prædestinatus, published by Sirmondus[63], inform us. But whether they admitted any other kind of baptism, or upon what ground they rejected this, we are not told: only we may probably conjecture, that it was upon that general vile principle of theirs, that material things were the work of an evil god, and therefore to be abhorred as polluted and profane. One branch of this heresy was afterwards called Paulicians from one Paulus and Johannes, the first founders of it. Euthymius[64], out of Photius, gives a large account of them, where he tells us, 'that though they really rejected and despised baptism, yet they pretended to receive it: but that was only with a deceitful equivocation; for they maintained that the word of the Gospel was baptism, because our Lord said, "I am the living water."' The learned Vossius[65] is of opinion, that those words, *Ego sum aqua viva, I am the living water,* was the form which these Paulicians used in baptism instead of the form of the Church. But he plainly mistakes Euthymius, who does not say that they used this as a form of words in their baptism; for they had no baptism at all, nor consequently any form of words for baptizing: but their opinion was, that believing in Christ, or the word or the truth of the Gospel, was all the baptism that was required of men, and that because Christ had said, "I am the living water." Yet, sometimes, as Euthymius relates in the same place[66], they would bring their children to the presbyters

and Paulicians.

[62] De Hæres. c. 46. (t. 8. p. 17 c.) Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre: nec quenquam eorum, quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.

[63] Hær. 46. ap. Oper. Sirmond. Paris. 1696. (t. 1. p. 486 b.) where the same words occur *de Manichæis.* [Conf. ibid. Hær. 90. (p. 507 a.) Dicunt baptismatis undam non universa peccata mundare.—It. Hist. Prædestinat. c. 4. (ap. Opuscul. Var. Paris. 1675. v. 3. p. 23.) The same words. Ed.]

[64] Panopl. part. 2. tit 21. p. 48. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 19. p. 205 g. 5.) Quinetiam cum baptismum aspernentur, illud tamen se fingunt suscipere: nam evangelii verba baptismum existimant, quoniam Dominus, *Ego sum,* inquit, *aqua viva.*

[65] De Bapt. disput. 1. thes. 2. p. 28. (t. 6. p. 255.) Præter istos [Seleucianos et Hermianos] etiam aquæ usum refugerunt Pauliciani: quippe qui in sacramentis aversarentur res materiales, solaque pronuntiatione verborum sacramentum perficerent. Quemadmodum nec verba dicebant, quæ ecclesia usurpat: sed ista, *Ego sum aqua viva.*

[66] Ibid. (p. ead. g. 12.) Liberos

of the Church to be baptized after the Catholic way, because they had an opinion that both baptism and the cross were of some advantage to the body for the cure of diseases, but of no other efficacy, benefit, or virtue to purge the soul. And such an opinion possessed the minds of many others, who had no further regard for baptism, but only as it was of use to free the body of some distemper or uncleanness. St. Austin[67] puts the question once or twice concerning some such persons who desired to be baptized with no other view but this. And Matthew Blastares[68] mentions a famous case of the Agarenes, who compelled the Christian clergy, that were under their dominion, to baptize their children before they would circumcise them; because they conceived this would contribute toward the prevention of those distempers and noisomenesses which are occasioned by circumcision. Upon this case a question was made in the Council of Constantinople under Lucas Chrysoberges, [patriarch of Constantinople, anno 1160,] Whether such persons, when they came over to the Christian faith, were to be rebaptized, or only anointed with chrism? and it was resolved[69]

etiam suos ab ecclesiæ presbyteris salutari baptismo volunt aliquando lustrari; existimant enim crucem et baptismum corpori prodesse. Horum tamen vim ad animæ purgationem pervenire non putant, nec ullam aliam afferre utilitatem.

[67] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 265 f.) Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia spiritali ad vitam regenerentur æternam; sed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere vel recipere sanitatem.

[68] Syntagm. Canonum, lit. b. c. 3. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 42 d.) *Ἔθος γοῦν ἐστὶ τῶν Ἀγαρηνῶν τοῖς πλείστοις, μὴ πρότερον τὰ σφέτερα περιτέμνειν βρέφη, πρὶν ἂν οἱ ὑποτελεῖς ὄντες αὐτοῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἄκοντες, ἀναγκασθῶσι ταῦτα βαπτίσαι. Ἐζητήθη τοίνυν τὰ περὶ τούτου ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν συνόδῳ, Λουκᾶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὸν πατριαρχικὸν ἰθύνοντος θρόνον, Εἰ δεῖ τοὺς τοιούτους τῇ ἀληθινῇ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστει προσερχομένους ἀναβαπτίζειν, ἢ μόνον χρίειν τῷ μύρῳ; καὶ ἐψηφίσθη, τούτους ἀναντιρρήτως αὖθις βαπτίζειν, ᾧπερ γὰρ ἐλούσαντο βάπτισμα, οὐ κατὰ σκοπὸν εὐσεβῆ, ἀλλ' ὡς φαρμακείᾳ ἢ ἐπαοιδίᾳ τινὶ τούτῳ ἐχρήσαντο· ἐφ' ᾧ μὴ νοσώδης ἢ δυσώδης ἡ κρᾶσις τῶν σωμάτων τοῖς περιτμηθησομένοις γενήσεται.*—Vid. Balsamon in Photii Nomocanon. tit. 13. de Laicis, c. 2. (ap. Justell. t. 2. pp. 1075, seqq.) et Baron. an. 1148. n. 81. (t. 12. p. 358 a.) It. an. 1145. n. 3. (ibid. p. 314 d.)

[69] [Vid. ap. Leunclav. Jus. Gr. Rom. l. 3. Sentent. Synod. 1. c. 12. De infantibus captivis baptizandis, et de Agarenis. (t. 1. p. 226)..... Persuasum est Agarenis fore ut sui liberi a dæmone vexentur, et tanquam canes male oleant, nisi baptismum Christianum assequantur. Quamobrem non ut omnium animæ sordium mundatorem, divinæque lucis et sanctificationis præbitorem, baptismum postulant [Agareni], sed tanquam veneficium et incantationem, &c. Ed.]

'that they ought, without controversy, to be rebaptized, since the baptism with which they were washed was not received with any pious intent, but only as an amulet or charm.'

These instances make the account, which Euthymius gives of the Paulicians, seem very probable, that though they had no regard for baptism as a Christian sacrament, yet they might sometimes make use of it, as the Saracens did, as an enchantment, or a sort of magical spell; which appears to be the only use they ever made of it, and that not in their own assemblies, where they had no sacraments at all, neither baptism nor the eucharist, but fraudulently receiving it in the Church at the hands of the Christian Catholic priests.

The reader may observe by the way, that these Paulicians were not the followers of Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch, who are commonly called Paulianists and Samosatenians, though Balsamon confounds them together; but they had their denomination from another Paulus Samosatensis and one Johannes, who revived and enlarged the heresy of the Manichees, as appears plainly from Euthymius. And Justellus[69] and Vossius[70] have observed the same out of Cedrenus, Theophanes, Matthew Blastares, Nicephorus, and other modern Greeks, with which it would be needless in this place to trouble the reader.

5. Some add to the forementioned sects, who rejected baptism, the heresy of the Messalians, or Euchites, who were so

What opinion the Messalians

[69] Not. in c. 19. Cod. Eccles. Univers. (t. 1. p. 74. col. 2.) Fuit et alius Paulus Samosatenus, Manichæorum hæreseos instaurator, a quo Pauliciani, quos Balsamo perperam confundit cum Pauli[ni]anistis. Cedrenus recte, Παυλικιανοὶ καὶ Μανιχαῖοι, μετωνομάσθησαν δὲ ἀντὶ Μανιχαίων Παυλικιανοὶ ἀπὸ Παύλου τινὸς Σαμοσατέως, υἱοῦ γυναικὸς Μανιχαίας, Καλλινίκης τοὔνομα. Idem tradit Matthæus Blastares in Synopsi, ubi aperte Pauli[ni]anistas a Paulicianis distinguit. Historia Miscella in Nicephoro, l. 24. *Manichæorum vero, qui nunc Pauliciani dicuntur, amicus erat.* Paulicianorum hæresim in Thracia propagatam fuisse sub Constantino Copronymo, Theophanes author est, eamque a Michaële imperatore damnatam testatur eadem Historia Miscella in ejus Vita: *Divino sane zelo imperator piissimus motus contra Manichæos, qui nunc Pauliciani dicuntur, capitalem animadversionem promulgavit.* Sed et Montanistæ baptizari jubentur, c. 112.

[70] De Bapt. disput. 20. thes. 1. p. 241. (t. 6. p. 331.) Ab hoc igitur Paulo Samosateno Paulianistæ vocabantur: uti ab altero Paulo Samosateno Pauliciani, qui Manichæi erant: etsi Balsamo confundat. Sed diversos esse, constat ex Cedreno, Matthæo Blastare in Synopsi, Historia Miscella in Nicephoro, et Michaële Imperatore, &c.

or Euchites had of baptism.

called from the Greek word εὐχὴ, *prayer*, and Messalians from the Syriac word *metsalach*, which is much of the same signification, because *they resolved all religion into prayer*. But it does not appear that they wholly rejected the sacrament of baptism: for then the Church would have ordered them upon their return to have been baptized as Jews or Pagans; which she never did, but only obliged them to anathematize their errors, in order to be admitted to communion; as may be collected from the decree of the general Council of Ephesus[71], made with relation to such of the clergy or laity as returned from them. But their error was in denying the principal part of the spiritual efficacy of baptism: they said indeed it granted remission of sins that were past, but added no strength or ability from the Spirit to withstand sin for the future. This we learn from Theodoret, who, comparing the doctrine of the Catholic Church and that of the Messalians upon this point together, delivers himself to this purpose. 'Baptism,' says he[72], 'is not like a razor only, as the Messalian enthusiasts call it, which takes away sins that are past, though it has this effect among many others; for if this were the only work of baptism, for what reason should we baptize infants, who have never yet tasted of sin? for the sacrament does not only promise this effect, but greater and more perfect things than that. It is the earnest of future good, the type of the resurrection to come hereafter, the communication of our Lord's passion, the participation of our Lord's resurrection, the garment of salvation, the clothing of joy, and the robe of light, or rather light itself.' So that we must allow Theodoret to be his own interpreter,

[71] C. Ephes. act. 7. (t. 3. p. 809 b.) Placuit . . . ut omnes, qui per universam provinciam hæretici Messaliani vel Enthusiastæ sunt; vel de ejus hæreseos morbo suspecti, sive clerici, sive laici sint, conveniantur, et, si quidem anathematizaverint, juxta ea quæ in prædicta synodo [scripto] pronuntiata sunt [in scriptis], si clerici fuerint, maneant clerici; si laici, ad communionem admittantur.

[72] Hæret. Fabul. l. 5. c. 18. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 441.) Οὐ γὰρ, ὡς οἱ φρενοβλαβεῖς Μεσσαλιανοὶ νομίζουσι, ξυρὸν μόνον μιμεῖται τὰ βάπτισμα, τὰς προγεγενημένας ἀφαιρούμενον ἁμαρτίας· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκ περιουσίας χαρίζεται· εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνον ἔργον ἦν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ἀνθ' ὅτου τὰ βρέφη βαπτίζομεν, οὐδέπω τῆς ἁμαρτίας γευσάμενα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπαγγέλλεται τὸ μυστήριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων μείζω, καὶ τελεώτερα· ἀρραβὼν γάρ ἐστι τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῆς ἐσομένης ἀναστάσεως τύπος, καὶ κοινωνία τῶν δεσποτικῶν παθημάτων, καὶ μετουσία τῆς δεσποτικῆς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου, [? σωτήριον,] καὶ χιτὼν εὐφροσύνης, καὶ στολὴ φωτοειδὴς, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸ φῶς.

when he seems to give a more harsh account of these Messalians in another place[73], describing them as men who taught, 'that no manner of advantage accrued from divine baptism to those who received it, but that it was only fervent prayer that expelled the in-dwelling devil out of men's minds.' For this is to be understood with the forementioned exception, that they allowed baptism so far to be useful, as to wash away all former sins, but not to grant any further perfection. And so Harmenopolus[74] represents their doctrine, as teaching, that neither baptism nor participation of the eucharist could give a man the perfection of a Christian, but only such prayer as they pretended to. In like manner Euthymius[75] describes them as maintaining, that baptism did not eradicate sin. They did not deny that it purged away former sins, but they would not allow any efficacy of the Spirit to be joined with it to resist or overcome sin for the future. Against which doctrine Euthymius thus argues: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now the Holy Ghost is a divine fire: for he de-

[73] Hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 11. (t. 3. p. 162. 22.) Μηδεμίαν ἐκ τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος ὠφέλειαν τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις γίνεσθαι· μόνην δὲ τὴν σπουδαίαν εὐχὴν τὸν δαίμονα τὸν ἔνοικον ἐξελαύνειν. [Conf. Hæret. Fabul. l. 4. c. 11. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 366.) Μεσσαλιανοὶ . . . . τὸ μὲν βάπτισμά φασι, μηδὲν ὀνεῖν τοὺς προσιόντας· . . . . ἡ δὲ ἐνδελεχὴς προσευχὴ, καὶ τὴν ῥίζαν τῆς ἁμαρτίας πρόρριζον ἀνασπᾷ, καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς συγκληρωθέντα πονηρὸν δαίμονα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξελαύνει. ED.]

[74] De Sectis, c. 18. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 536 d. 6.) Οἱ Μασαλιανοὶ, τὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων νοσοῦντες, προσεξεῦρον καὶ ἄλλ' ἄττα μιαρώτερα· τὸν γὰρ νοῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων κατέχεσθαι λέγουσι· τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν, τῶν δαιμόνων εἶναι κοινωνικήν· τὸ βάπτισμα, μὴ τελειοῦν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, μηδὲ τὴν μετάληψιν· ἀλλὰ μόνην τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐχήν.

[75] Panopl. part. 2. tit. 22. p. 55. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 19. p. 218 b. 15.) Negant divinum baptismum posse radices evellere peccatorum. Sed Dominus noster Jesus Christus ait: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non intrabit in regnum Dei.* Itaque cum ignis divinus sit Spiritus Sanctus, nam et in specie ignearum linguarum super discipulos descendit, de quo et præcursor dicebat turbis, Christi testificans excellentiam, *Ille vos baptizabit in Spiritu Sancto et igne,* quemadmodum ignis sensibus expositus, si silvam corripit, omnia comburit, quæ sunt super faciem terræ, et radices exsiccat, et locum a sordibus expurgat, sic et Spiritus Sanctus, ac multo etiam magis. Ignis enim est, consumens nequitiam eorum qui baptizantur. Has enim arbitror ab istis radices peccatorum existimari. Quod si et aqua purgat omnino corpora hominum, quis dubitet, quin Spiritus Sanctus multo magis, sine ulla comparatione, cicatrices, et maculas, et sordes animarum, expurget ac deleat? Neque solum expurget et deleat, verum etiam illustret; nec illustret modo, sed munera largiatur, ut docent Apostoli, imprimisque Paulus in distributionibus gratiarum Spiritus Sancti, quibus afficiuntur illi, qui baptizantur.

scended in the form of fiery tongues upon the disciples, and the forerunner of Christ spake of this to the multitude, when he testified of the excellency of Christ, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." As therefore material fire, when it catches a wood, burns all things upon the surface of the earth, dries up the roots, and purges the place from filth; so the Holy Spirit does, and much more: for it is a fire consuming the iniquity of those who are baptized; and it not only purges and obliterates the spots, and scars, and filth of the soul, but also illuminates and endows it with many gifts, as the Apostles, and especially St. Paul, teach us, where they speak of the distribution of the graces of the Holy Spirit, which are conferred on those who are baptized.'

From this account of the Messalians it appears, that they were neither Anabaptists nor Quakers; they neither rejected the baptism of adult persons nor infants. For the true state of the controversy between them and the Church was not about the use of the outward element of water in baptism, but about the internal and spiritual effects of it, which the Messalians confined to remission of sins, but the Church extended to many other noble benefits, which were the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. Upon which account the Church never rebaptized the Messalians, that we read of, as she did the Manichees and such other heretics, who rejected the use of water, which was the outward element which Christ had appointed. If this was either neglected, or any other element used instead of it, the baptism was esteemed not only irregular, but null, as wanting one necessary and essential part, which could not be supplied but by a new baptism. And therefore when a certain Jew had been baptized in sand, for want of water in the wilderness, Dionysius, bishop of Ascalon, ordered him to be rebaptized, as Johannes Moschus[76] tells the story: and this was done, not because he was baptized by a layman in extreme necessity, but, as Archbishop Whitgift[77] after the Centuriators[78] has observed, 'because the baptism wanted water.' Such

[76] Prat. Spirit. c. 176. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1133 a. 11.) Ἐλθόντες δὲ ἐν Ἀσκαλῶνι, κ. τ. λ.

[77] Defence, Tract. 9. (p. 519.) There is recited a story in the Centuries, &c.

[78] Centur. Magdeburg. cent. 2. c. 6. p. 82. (p. 109. 60.) Cum enim Judæus quispiam, eo tempore, quo Romæ imperium Marcus Aurelius Antoninus tenuit, in arido forte et deserto loco cum Christianis iter fa-

was the Church's opinion of the necessity of water-baptism, that where it might be had, she never thought fit to dispense with the neglect or contempt of it; and therefore she urged the necessity of it against those ancient heretics who despised it, even whilst she judged favourably of such catechumens as died without baptism, not through contempt, but unavoidable necessity: of which I have given a particular account in the twentieth and following sections of the second chapter of the last Book.

Indeed there is one exception against this in some collections of the Canon Law. For there we have a decree under the name of Pope Siricius[79], which says, 'that if an infant is baptized in wine instead of water, in case of necessity, it is no crime, and the baptism shall stand good.' But as Antonius Augustinus and Baluzius have observed, this was no decree of Siricius, but of Stephen II. about the eighth century. So that it cannot be pleaded as a competent authority to show what was the ancient practice of the Church. Antonius Augustinus is very positive that the primitive Church had never any such custom: and it seems pretty evident from that saying of St. Ambrose[80], that if we take away water, the sacrament of bap-

ceret, et psalmos una cum iis caneret; evenit, ut morbo repentino et gravi Judæus eo in itinere corriperetur: adeo ut de salute sua, cum ipse, tum hi, quorum comes erat, desperarent. Multis igitur precibus solicitat ille Christianos, ne se ita in extremis constitutum relinquerent, sed sacrum lavacrum sibi conferrent. Illi vero cum hoc ei se facere posse negarent, quia et sacerdote et aqua destituerentur, sine quibus baptismus fieri non posset; magis Judæus et impensius obsecrare, et adjuratione eos, ne hoc sibi negarent, adigere. Ad quod illi, detractis homini vestibus, arena eum pro aqua ter conspersere; addentes, baptizare se eum in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Quam rem continuo miraculum consecutum est: ut nimirum is, qui, propter affectionem gravem et periculosam, pedibus pridem insistere non posset, nunc restitutus reliquum, quod superesset itineris, firmus et validus cum illis conficeret. Quum igitur ad locum suum rediissent; episcopus Alexandriæ, ab illis consultus de sententia ecclesiæ, respondit, Baptizatum esse Judæum; si modo aqua denuo perfunderetur.

[79] Antonius Augustinus cites it out of a Spanish Collection of Canons, [De Emend. Gratian. (p. 200.) .... Vino ægrotum baptizari posse, modo in nomine Trinitatis baptizetur,] and Baluzius from one in France, under the name of Siricius: [Not. in l. c. (ibid. 431.) juxt. Ed. Paris. 1672. 8vo.] Presbyter qui in vino baptizat proxima necessitate, ut æger non periclitetur, pro tali re nulla ei culpa ascribatur. Si vero aqua aderat, et necessitas talis non urgebat, hic communione privetur. Infans vero ille, si in Sancta Trinitate baptizatus est, in eo baptismo permaneat.

[80] De iis qui initiantur, [a]. De

tism cannot stand. But among the Moderns, Beza[81] and some of the Schoolmen, Tolet and Valentia, determine otherwise; against whose resolution I am not concerned to dispute, but only to declare what I take to have been the more current and received opinion of the primitive writers of the Church.

CHAP. III.

Of the ancient form of baptism, and of such heretics as altered or corrupted it.

The usual form of baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

1. NEXT to the matter of baptism, it will be proper to consider the form of words in which it was anciently administered. And this was generally such a form of words as made express mention of every Person of the blessed Trinity, according as our Saviour did at the first institution, when he commanded his disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This the ancient author of the Recognitions[82] means, when he says, 'men were baptized under the appellation of the triple mystery.' And again[83], 'by invocating the name of the Blessed Trinity.' Tertullian[84] refers this to the institution of Christ: 'The law of baptizing was imposed, and the form prescribed, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."' In another place[85] he says, 'Christ appointed baptism to be administered not in the name of one, but three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Therefore we are dipped not once, but thrice, unto every Person at the mention of each name.' Cyprian[86] derives this practice likewise from the insti-

Mysteriis,] c. 4. (t. 2. p. 330 b. n. 20.) .... Nec iterum sine aqua regenerationis mysterium est.

[81] Ep. 2. ad Tillium, (p. 28.) Desit etiam aqua, et tamen baptismus alicujus differri cum ædificatione non possit, nec debeat: ego certe quovis alio liquore non minus rite quam aqua baptizarim.

[82] L. 6. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 551.) .... Qui baptizantur sub appellatione triplicis sacramenti.

[83] L. 3. c. 67. (ibid. p. 531.) Baptizabitur autem unusquisque vestrum in aquis perennibus, nomine Trinæ Beatitudinis invocato super se.

[84] De Bapt. c. 13. (p. 229 c.) Lex enim tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta, Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomen [al. nomine] Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.

[85] Cont. Prax. c. 26. (p. 516 b.) .... Et novissime mandans, ut tinguerent in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, non in unum: nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in Personas singulas tinguimur.

[86] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 200. (p.

tution, saying, 'the Lord after his resurrection taught his disciples after what manner they should baptize, when he said, "Go teach all nations, &c.," where he delivered the doctrine of the Trinity, unto which mystery, or sacrament, the nations were to be baptized.' And he argues further[87] against such heretics as baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ, from the same principle, that Christ commanded the nations to be baptized, not into one Person, but a complete and united Trinity. Hence Optatus[88] calls baptism 'the laver which Christ commanded to be celebrated in the name of the Trinity,' and 'that holy water which flowed from the fountain of those three names.' And to mention no more authorities, which are innumerable, St. Austin[89] observes, 'that this was not only the general practice of the Catholic Church, but of most heresies also: for one might more easily find heretics that did not baptize at all, than such as retained baptism without using those evangelical words, of which the Creed consists, and without which baptism cannot be consecrated.'

This form of words generally thought necessary to be used in baptism.

2. And hence it appears, that St. Austin, and these other writers thought this precise form of words necessary to be used in the administration of baptism, by virtue of the original appointment and institution. And this may be further evidenced to have been the general sense of the Ancients, some one or two only excepted. The Apostolical Canons[90] order

307.) Dominus enim post resurrectionem discipulos suos mittens, quemadmodum baptizare deberent instituit et docuit, dicens, 'Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra: Ite ergo et docete gentes omnes, baptizantes eas in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.' Insinuat Trinitatem, cujus sacramento gentes baptizarentur.

[87] Ibid. p. 206. (p. 311.) Quomodo quidam dicunt, foris extra ecclesiam, immo et contra ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunque et quomodocunque gentilem baptizatum, remissionem peccatorum consequi posse; quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari jubeat in plena et adunata Trinitate?

[88] L. 5. p. 85. (p. 101.) Christi vox est, *Qui semel lotus est, non habet iterum necessitatem lavandi, quia est mundus totus;* et de eo lavacro pronuntiavit quod de Trinitate celebrandum esse mandaverat .... de aqua sancta, quæ de trium nominum fontibus inundat.

[89] De Bapt. l. 6. c. 25. (t. 9. p. 176 d.) Cæterum quis nesciat, non esse baptismum Christi, si verba evangelica, quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed facilius inveniuntur hæretici, qui omnino non baptizent, quam qui non illis verbis baptizent.

[90] C. 49. [al. 48.] (Cotel. [c. 41.] v. 1. p. 444.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, κατὰ τὴν Κυρίου διάταξιν μὴ βαπτίσῃ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' εἰς τρεῖς Ἀνάρχους, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς Υἱοὺς, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς Παρακλήτους, καθαιρείσθω.

every bishop and presbyter, that shall presume to baptize any other way, than according to the command of the Lord, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be deposed. And Athanasius[91] speaks of such baptism as null, that is any otherwise delivered: 'He that takes away any one Person from the Trinity, and is baptized only in the name of the Father, or only in the name of the Son, or only in the Father and the Son, without the Spirit, receives nothing, but remains void and uninitiated; for in the Trinity alone initiation is given.' He says in another place[92], 'that baptism, which is as it were the compendium of our whole faith, is not given in the name of the Word, but of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

Didymus of Alexandria[93] treads in the steps of Athanasius. 'I cannot suppose any one,' says he, 'so mad and void of understanding, as to think that to be perfect baptism, which is given in the name of the Father and Son, without the assumption of the Holy Spirit; or in the name of the Father and Holy Ghost, omitting the name of the Son; or in the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, without first mentioning the name of the Father. For though any man should be of such a stony heart, as I may say, or so much beside himself, as to leave out one of the appointed names in baptism, setting up himself a lawgiver in opposition to Christ, his baptism will be imperfect, and altogether insufficient to grant remission of sins to those whom he esteems baptized by him.' Idacius Clarus[94] asserts

[91] Ep. ad Serapion. t. 1. p. 204. [al. Ep. 1. ad Serapion. n. 30.] (t. 1. part. 2. p. 542 b.) . . . 'Ο δὲ ὑπεξαιρούμενός τι τῆς Τριάδος, καὶ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὀνόματι βαπτιζόμενος, ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἢ χωρίς γε τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐδὲν λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ κενὸς καὶ ἀτελὴς αὐτός τε καὶ ὁ δοκῶν διδόναι διαμένει· ἐν τῇ Τριάδι γὰρ ἡ τελείωσίς ἐστιν.

[92] Orat. 5. cont. Arian. p. 535. [al. Orat. 4. n. 21.] (ibid. part. 1. p. 501 f.) Τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, ἐν ᾧ πάσης πίστεως ἡμῶν ἡ σύστασις ὁρμεῖ, οὐκ εἰς Λόγον, ἀλλ' εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα δίδοται.

[93] De Spir. Sanct. l. 2. [c. 24.] ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 9. p. 37. (ap. Galland. t. 6. p. 272 b.) Non arbitror quenquam tam vecordem atque insanum futurum, ut perfectum baptisma putet [id], quod datur in nomine Patris et Filii, sine assumptione Spiritus Sancti: aut rursus in nomine Patris, et Spiritus Sancti, Filii vocabulo prætermisso; aut certe in nomine Filii et Spiritus Sancti, non præposito vocabulo Patris. Licet enim quis posset esse [al. exsistere] saxei, ut ita dicam, cordis, et penitus mentis alienæ, qui ita baptizare conetur, ut unum de præceptis nominibus prætermittat, videlicet contrarius legislator Christi; tamen sine perfectione baptizabit; immo penitus a peccatis liberare non poterit, quos a se baptizatos existimaverit.

[94] L. 3. cont. Varimundum, [al. Varimadum,] ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 4. p.

the same, arguing thus against Varimundus, the Arian, for the divinity of the Holy Ghost: 'If the Holy Ghost be not equal to the Father and Son in the substance of the Deity, why then is that sacrament of baptism imperfect which is given without him?' St. Basil[95] has a whole chapter to the same purpose. The very title of it is against those, who asserted that it was sufficient to give baptism only in the name of the Lord: and whereas they urged, that in several passages of Scripture baptism was said to be given only in the name of Christ, he answers, 'that in all those places though the name of Christ was only mentioned, yet the whole Trinity was understood.' Which he confirms from the like expressions concerning the Holy Ghost, (1 Cor. 12, 13.) "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body:" and, (Acts 1, 5.) "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence:" where the Apostles seem only to make mention of the Holy Ghost in baptism. 'But,' says he, 'no one may from hence conclude, that that baptism is perfect, wherein the Holy Ghost alone is named. For the tradition ought to remain inviolable, which was given by the quickening grace.' He means *the form of baptizing*, given by the command of Christ, Matth. 28, 19. Upon which he concludes, 'that as we believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, so we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Therefore both Vossius[96] and Petavius[97] are greatly mistaken to allege St. Basil as one of those who asserted, that baptism in the name of Christ alone was allowable, when he so plainly and directly writes against it.

300. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 5. p. 745 d. 16.) Si enim Spiritus Sanctus Deitatis substantia Patri et Filio non coæquatur, cur in sacramento sacri baptismatis nihil absque illo completur?

[95] De Spir. Sanct. c. 12. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 32 d. n. 28.) Ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο τέλειον ἄν τις εἴπῃ [al. εἴποι] τὸ βάπτισμα, ᾧ μόνον τοῦ Πνεύματος ὄνομα [al. τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πνεύματος] ἐπεκλήθη· χρὴ γὰρ ἀπαράβατον μένειν [ἀεὶ] τὴν ἐν τῇ ζωοποιῷ χάριτι δεδομένην παράβασιν [al. παράδοσιν] . . . ὡς γὰρ πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ βαπτιζόμεθα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

[96] De Bapt. disput. 2. thes. 5. p. 51. (t. 6. p. 263.) Secutus vero hac parte [Ambrosius], ut facere solet, Basilium; cujus ista verba περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσηγορία τοῦ παντός ἐστιν ὁμολογία· δηλοῖ γὰρ τόν τε χρίοντα Θεὸν, καὶ χρισθέντα Υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ χρίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα.

[97] De Trin. l. 2. c. 14. n. 6. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 108. col. dextr.) . . . In ea esse Basilius sententia videtur, baptismum in solo Spiritus Sancti nomine tributum, perinde ac Christi solius, ratum ac validum fuisse.

Many other testimonies might here be inserted out of Theodoret[98], Gregory Nazianzen[99], and Nyssen[1], Theophylact[2], and others[3], but I shall only add further the decree of Pope Vigilius[4], which shows both the practice of the Church and the severity of her censures against any one that should pretend to transgress this settled rule of baptizing. 'If any bishop or presbyter,' says he, 'baptize not according to the command of the Lord, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, but in one Person of the Trinity, or in two, or in three Fathers, or in three Sons, or in three Comforters, let him be cast out of the Church of God.'

[98] Ep. 146. ad Ioan. Œconom. (t. 4. part. 2. p. 1269.) *Διά τοι τοῦτο τοῦ Κυρίου προστεταχότος βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὁ τρισμακάριος Πέτρος τοῖς τὸ κήρυγμα δεδεγμένοις, ἐρομένοις τί χρὴ ποιῆσαι, Πιστεύσατε, ἔφη, καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ὡς ταυτησὶ τῆς προσηγορίας πᾶσαν ἐχούσης τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος τὴν δύναμιν.*

[99] Orat. 24. (t. 1. p. 431 a.) *Ἐπιδημεῖ τοῖς περὶ Κορνήλιον πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος· ἄλλοις, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων· ὥστε ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ἔκ τε ὧν ἐπιφοιτᾷ δεσποτικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐ δουλικῶς, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἐπιζητεῖται πρὸς τὴν τελείωσιν, τὴν θεότητα μαρτυρεῖσθαι τοῦ Πνεύματος.*

[1] De Bapt. Christ. (t. 3. p. 372 c.) *Καταλιπὼν δὲ ἐμοὶ συμπλέκεσθαι, ἀντίστηθι ταῖς τοῦ Κυρίου φωναῖς, εἰ δύνασαι, αἱ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐνομοθέτησαν. Τί δέ φησι τὸ τοῦ Δεσπότου παράγγελμα; Βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.*

[2] In Luc. 24. (t. 1. p. 497 c. 8.) *Πῶς δὲ τὸ βάπτισμα νοήσομεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ μόνον γίνεσθαι, καὶ ταῦτα ἀλλαχοῦ διδασκόμενοι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τελεῖν τοῦτο; Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτό φαμεν, ὅτι τὸ βάπτισμα ὅταν λέγωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γίνεσθαι, οὐ τοῦτο λέγομεν, ὅτι δεῖ ἐπὶ μόνῳ τῷ Χριστοῦ ὀνόματι τοῦτο τελεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βάπτισμα, ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβαπτίσατο, τουτέστι πνευματικὸν, οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκόν, κ. τ. λ.*

[3] Fulgentius, de Incarnat. c. 11. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 203 e. 11.) Propterea omnis, qui in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, sacramento sanctæ regenerationis abluitur, non nisi in Christi morte ac nomine baptizatur, ut evidenter appareat, illi nos consepultos esse per baptismum in morte, in cujus uno cum Patris et Spiritus Sancti constat nomine baptizatos.—Cyrillus, Dialog. 7. de Trinit. (t. 5. p. 633 b.) *Οὐχ ὧδε μυσταγωγεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἀποστόλοις κεκέλευκεν ὁ Σωτήρ; Πορευθέντες γάρ, φησι, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Τοιγάρτοι καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἤρετό τινας, εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες; ἀποφησάντων δὲ τοῦτο ἐκείνων, καὶ ἀναφανδὸν εἰρηκότων, Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιόν ἐστιν, ἠκούσαμεν, ἐπετίμα λέγων, Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; οὐκ ἐν καλῷ γενέσθαι τὴν πίστιν εἰδὼς, οὔτε μὴν ἀρτίως ἔχειν δύνασθαι ποτὲ, εἰ μὴ πράττοιτο τελείως, εἰς Θεὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐκφέρουσα.*

[4] Ep. 2. ad Eutherum, c. 6. (CC. t. 5. p. 313 d.) Si quis episcopus aut presbyter juxta præceptum Domini non baptizaverit in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, sed in una persona Trinitatis, aut in duabus, aut in tribus Patribus, aut in tribus Filiis, aut in tribus Paracletis, projiciatur de ecclesia Dei.

3. Indeed among all the writings of the Ancients, I have never yet met with any but two, that plainly and directly allow or approve of any other form of baptism, save that which was appointed by Christ at the institution. Gennadius[5] mentions one Ursinus, an African monk, who, he says, wrote a book, which is now lost, wherein he asserted, against such as were for rebaptizing all heretics, 'that it was not lawful to rebaptize those, who were baptized either simply in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but it was sufficient for both sorts of them, upon confession of the Trinity, to receive the bishop's confirmation, in order to obtain eternal life.' This author plainly distinguishes between the two forms of baptizing, one with explicit mention of the three Persons of the Trinity, and the other in the name of Christ alone; both which he makes to be lawful, and equivalent in sense, though differing in words from one another. And St. Ambrose, I confess, seems to have been of the same opinion: for he takes all those expressions of Scripture, which speak of being baptized in the name of Christ, to mean, the using such a form as this, 'I baptize thee in the name of Christ,' without any express mention of the Three Persons, though the whole Trinity was implied in it. 'He that is blessed in Christ,' says he[6], 'is blessed in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; because the name is one,

Whether baptism in the name of Christ alone was ever allowed in the Church?

[5] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 27. (int. Oper. Hieron. t. 2. p. 965.) Ursinus monachus scripsit adversus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens, nec legitimum esse nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine [vel simpliciter] Christi, vel in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizentur: sed post [Sanctæ] Trinitatis et Christi simplicem confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manus impositionem Catholici sacerdotis.

[6] De Spir. Sanct. l. 1. c. 3. (t. 2. p. 607 e, seqq. nn. 40, 41, 42, 44.)... Qui benedicitur in Christo, benedicitur in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, quia unum nomen, potestas una ..... Denique Æthiops, eunuchus Candaces reginæ, baptizatus in Christo plenum mysterium consecutus est... Quemadmodum si unum in sermone comprehendas, aut Patrem, aut Filium, aut Spiritum Sanctum, fide autem nec Patrem, nec Filium, nec Spiritum Sanctum abneges, plenum est fidei sacramentum; ita etiam quamvis, et Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum dicas, et aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritus Sancti minuas potestatem, vacuum est omne sacramentum [al. mysterium].... Qui Unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo unctus est Filius, et ipsum qui unctus est Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum quo unctus est, designasti. ....Et si Patrem dicas, et Filium ejus, et Spiritum oris ejus pariter indicasti, si tamen id etiam corde comprehendas.

and the power one. The Ethiopian eunuch, who was baptized in Christ, had the sacrament complete. If a man names only a single Person expressly in words, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, so long as he does not deny in his faith either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is complete: as on the other hand, if a man in words express all the three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in his faith diminishes the power either of the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is void.' He says further, 'he that names but one Person, designs thereby the whole Trinity; he that names Christ only, intends both the Father by whom the Son is anointed, and the Son himself who is anointed, and the Spirit with which he is anointed. And he that names only the Father, does in like manner intend both his Son and the Spirit of his mouth, if he truly believe them in his heart.'

So that according to St. Ambrose, it was a sufficient baptism, though only one Person, Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, was expressly mentioned; because in one name by an orthodox believer all the rest were implied. But this appears to have been a singular opinion in St. Ambrose, contrary to the general stream and current of the ancient writers. For though Petavius joins St. Basil with him; and Vossius after Soto makes Cyprian, and Athanasius, and the author of the *Opus Imperfectum* under the name of St. Chrysostom, to be abettors of the same assertion; yet it is clear from what has been alleged before, out of Cyprian, Athanasius, and Basil, that they were of the contrary opinion, and esteemed it an error and transgression against the first institution, to give baptism only in the name of Christ. Whence it is also further evident, that they did not understand those passages of Scripture, which speak of baptizing in the name of Jesus, or the Lord, or Christ, as new forms of baptizing, different from the original form delivered by Christ; but as Eulogius in Photius[7] has

[7] Biblioth. cod. 280. (p. 1608. 58.) Τὸ *εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν βαπτισθῆναι σημαίνοι ἂν τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν καὶ παράδοσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, τουτέστιν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.*—Conf. August. cont. Maximin. l. 2. c. 17. (t. 8. p. 715 a.) Si autem, quia non est nominatus [Spiritus Sanctus], quod etiam per illum facta sit creatura, quando de Filio dictum est, *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt*, ideo putas, Dei Spiritum non esse Creatorem, procul dubio nec in ejus nomine poteris baptizatos dicere, quibus ait Petrus, *Agite pœnitentiam, et baptizetur*

explained them, 'to be baptized into Christ Jesus, signifies to be baptized according to the command and tradition of Jesus Christ; that is in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' According to which sense, it follows, that the form of baptizing delivered by Christ was not changed, as some imagine, but precisely observed even by the Apostles, and after them by the general consent and practice of the Catholic Church.

Of alterations made in the form of baptism. First, By the Tritheists and Priscillianists.

4. It is true, indeed, as sects grew up and increased in the Church, some innovations were made in this matter among them. For though, as St. Austin observes, the greatest part of heretics, who retained any baptism at all, retained also the old form of the Church; yet some there were who varied from it, and brought in new forms of their own, according as their fancies or the genius of their heresies led them.

There were some very early that turned the doctrine of the Trinity into Tritheism, and instead of Three Divine Persons under the economy of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, brought in three collateral, co-ordinate, and self-originated beings, making them three absolute and independent principles, without any relation of Father or Son, which is the most proper notion of three Gods. And having made this change in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, they made another change answerable to it in the form of baptism. For instead of baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they brought in an unheard-of form of baptizing in the name of three unoriginated principles, as we learn from one of those called the Apostolical Canons [8], which is directly levelled against them in these words: 'If any bishop or presbyter baptize not according to the command of Christ, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but in three Unoriginated Principles, or in three Sons, or in three Paracletes, or Holy Ghosts, let him be deposed.' This canon does not describe these heretics by any name, but we may conjecture

unusquisque vestrum in nomine Domini Jesu Christi, quia non ait, *Et Spiritus Sancti:* nec *in Patris nomine,* quia nec ipse ibi est nominatus. Si autem, etiam non nominatis Patre et Spiritu Sancto, in nomine Jesu Christi jussi sunt baptizari, et tamen intelliguntur non baptizati, nisi in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti; cur non sic audis de Filio Dei, *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt,* ut et non nominatum intelligas ibi etiam Spiritum Sanctum?

[8] C. 49. See s. 2. p. 27. n. 90.

from another canon of the first Council of Bracara[9], that they were the Gnostics, who first introduced this kind of Tritheism, or doctrine of Three Gods, into the world, which was afterwards taken up by the Priscillianists, and both of them condemned together in that Council. For so the canon words it: 'If any one shall introduce any strange names of the Divinity, beside the Holy Trinity, saying, that in the Godhead there is a Trinity of Trinities, as the Gnostics and Priscillianists maintain, let him be *anathema*.' This was the consequence of asserting three unbegotten principles; for hereby they made three Fathers, and three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts, which was a Trinity of Trinities, as the Council charges them. And in compliance with this grand error they sometimes baptized in the name of three Fathers, or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts. As seems pretty evident from that decree of Pope Vigilius[10], made against all such heterodox innovations: 'If any bishop or presbyter baptize not according to the command of the Lord, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but in one person of the Trinity, or in two, or in three Fathers, or in three Sons, or in three Paracletes, or Holy Ghosts, let him be cast out of the Church.'

Secondly, by Menander and his followers.

5. Another corruption of the form of baptism was introduced by Menander, who was a disciple of Simon Magus, and to all his master's heresies added this of his own, 'that no one could be saved, except he was baptized in his name,' as Tertullian[11] informs us. The reason of this innovation is assigned by Irenæus[12] and Epiphanius[13], who tell us that he took upon

[9] [Al. Bracar. 2.] c. 2. (t. 5. p. 837 e.) Si quis extra Sanctam Trinitatem alia nescio quæ divinitatis nomina introducit, dicens, quod in ipsa divinitate sit Trinitas Trinitatis, sicut Gnostici et Priscilliani dixerunt, anathema sit.

[10] See s. 2. n. 4, preceding.

[11] De Præscript. c. 46. (p. 219 c.) Quicquid se Simon dixerat, hoc se Menander esse dicebat, negans habere posse quenquam salutem, nisi in nomine suo baptizatus fuisset.

[12] L. 1. c. 21. (p. 96. 1.) Hujus [Simonis] successor fuit Menander, Samarites genere, qui et ipse ad summum magiæ pervenit. Qui primam quidem Virtutem incognitam ait omnibus; se autem eum esse, qui missus sit ab invisibilibus, salvatorem pro salute hominum. Mundum autem factum ab angelis; quos et ipse similiter, ut Simon, ab Ennoia emissos dicit.

[13] Hær. 22. Menandrian. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 61 a.) Μείζονα δὲ κυβεῖαν οὗτος ὑπὲρ τὸν πρότερον ἐργασάμενος, ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν πεπέμφθαι εἰς σωτηρίαν δῆθεν, καὶ εἰς τὸ συνάγειν τινὰς εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μυστήριον, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπὸ τῶν τὸν κόσμον πεποιηκότων ἀγγελων καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν κατακυριευθῆναι.

him to be the Messias: for he taught, that he was the person sent for the salvation of men; and to gather a Church by mysteries of his own appointing, to deliver men from the dominion of the angels, and principalities, and powers that made the world. And Theodoret gives the same account of him: for he says[14], 'he called himself the Saviour of the world, and taught that men were saved by being baptized in his name, by which means also they got power over the powers that made the world.' But this was so absurd an heresy, that as Epiphanius observes, it never prevailed much in the Church. Menander had promised his proselytes, as Tertullian says[15], 'that all who would be baptized in his name, should be immortal and incorruptible, and have the benefit of an immediate resurrection:' but experience in a little time confuted this foolery; for in an hundred years' time none of his immortal apostles appeared, to convince any doubting Thomas of the truth of such a pretended resurrection. And so this vain attempt upon the baptism of Christ quickly sunk by its own absurdity.

Thirdly, by the Elceseans.

6. A no less absurd innovation was made by the Elceseans, so called from their founder, one Elcesai, who taught them enchantments and invocation of demons, and to use baptisms in the name or confession of the elements, or letters, as Theodoret[16] represents them. Though what sort of baptism this was, is not very easy to conjecture, there being scarce any one besides Theodoret that gives any account of this heresy. But they were great admirers of astrology and magic, and upon that account perhaps might bring the elements into their baptism, by composition of certain letters and numbers used by them in their magical operations.

[14] Hæret. Fabul. l. 1. c. 2. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 289.) Σωτῆρα ἑαυτὸν προσηγόρευε. .... Σώζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν βαπτιζομένους, καὶ κρείττους ἀποτελεῖσθαι, κἂν τῷ δὲ τῷ βίῳ, καὶ λαμβάνειν δύναμιν εἰς τὸ ῥᾷστα τῶν κοσμοποιῶν δυνάμεων περιγίνεσθαι.

[15] De Anima, c. 50. (p. 300 d.) In hoc scilicet se a superna et arcana potestate legatum, ut immortales et incorruptibiles et statim resurrectionis compotes fiant, qui baptisma ejus induerint ... Ubi sunt illi, quos Menander ipse perfudit, quos in Stygem suam mersit? Apostoli perennes veniant, assistant: videat illos meus Thomas, audiat, contrectet, et credidit [leg. credat].

[16] Hæret. Fabul. l. 2. c. 7. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 333.) Ἐπῳδαῖς δὲ καὶ δαιμόνων ἐπικλήσεσι καὶ οὗτοι κέχρηνται καὶ βαπτίσμασιν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν στοιχείων ὁμολογίᾳ.

Fourthly, by the Montanists and Sabellians.

7. The Montanists also, or Cataphrygians, introduced a new form of baptism. For Montanus their founder took upon him to be the Holy Ghost, and made himself two prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, who pretended to write books by inspiration. Therefore their followers having them in great esteem corrupted the old form of baptism, and administered it in the name of Father, Son, and Montanus, or Priscilla, as St. Basil[17] acquaints us, who therefore judges their baptism to be null, and necessary to be repeated when they came over to the Catholic Church. Theophylact[18] gives the same account of them, telling us, 'that their foul and stinking tongues baptized in the name of Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla.' By which he does not mean, that they used those three names instead of the Trinity, but that they added the name of Montanus, or Priscilla, or Maximilla, to the Father and Son, instead of the Holy Ghost. For which reason, most probably, the Council of Laodicea[19] orders them to be rebaptized, notwithstanding that some of them had received a pretended ordination, and were advanced not only to the dignity of bishops, but to the title of patriarchs and *maximi* among them, as the Council of Laodicea words it. And the same decree was made against them in the first general Council of Constantinople[20], and some others also.

St. Jerom seems further to intimate, that these Montanists were, as to the doctrine of the Trinity, really Sabellians; for though they pretended to believe a Trinity of Divine Persons, yet it was but equivocally, in the same way as Sabellius had done before, whose three persons were no more than three names, or different appearances of one and the same person.

[17] Ep. Canonic. c. 1. [ap. Oper. Basil. Ep. 188. Canonic. Prim.] (CC. t. 1. p. 1717 c.) *Τίνα οὖν λόγον ἔχει, τὸ τούτων βάπτισμα ἐγκριθῆναι, τῶν βαπτιζόντων εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Μονταν̀ον, ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν; οὐ γὰρ ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ εἰς τὰ μὴ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν βαπτισθέντες.*

[18] In Luc. 24. p. 546. (t. 1. p. 497 e. 7.) *Ποῦ λοιπὸν αἱ βορβορώδεις γλῶσσαι τῶν βαπτιζόντων εἰς Μονταν̀ον, καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν, καὶ Μαξιμίλλαν;*

[19] C. 8. (t. 1. p. 1497 b.) *Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν λεγομένων Φρυγῶν ἐπιστρέφοντας, εἰ καὶ ἐν κλήρῳ νομιζομένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς τυγχάνοιεν, εἰ καὶ μέγιστοι λέγοιντο· τοὺς τοιούτους μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας κατηχεῖσθαί τε καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων.*

[20] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 c.) *Μονταν̀ιστὰς τοὺς ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, καὶ Σαβελλιανοὺς ..... ὡς Ἕλληνας δεχόμεθα· καὶ οὕτως κατηχοῦμεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς χρονίζειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀκροᾶσθαι τῶν γραφῶν· καὶ τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζομεν.*

Therefore St. Jerom[21] says, 'The Montanists differed from the Catholics in the very rule of faith: for we assert Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, every one distinct in his own person, though united in substance; but they, following the opinion of Sabellius, bring the Trinity to the narrow restraints of one person;' that is, as he explains it a little after, they said 'that God at first intended to save the world by Moses and the Prophets; but because he could not effect his design that way, he assumed a body of the Virgin, and preached in Christ, under the species of a Son, and suffered death for our sakes. And because by these two degrees he could not save the world, at last he descended by the Holy Ghost into Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla; and made Montanus, who was an eunuch, and but half a man, have that plenitude of prophecy, which Paul himself could not pretend to have.' From this account of St. Jerom, it is evident the Montanists in point of doctrine were really Sabellians, and believed but one person in the Godhead under different appearances, or manifestations of himself, which they called *πρόσωπα, persons*, in an equivocal sense; whereby they imposed upon many Catholics, and among the rest upon Theodoret[22], to make them believe them sound and orthodox men, when yet they asserted three persons in no other sense, than Simon Magus, and Praxeas, and Noetus, and Sabellius, and all the Patripassians had done before them. Now it is very probable the Sabellians had introduced a new form of baptism, correspondent to their principles, for which reason all the Councils that mention them order them to be rebaptized[23]; and the Montanists, following the doctrine of

[21] Ep. 54. [al. 41.] ad Marcellam adv. Montanum. (t. 1. p. 186 e.) Primum in fidei regula discrepamus. Nos Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum in sua unumquemque persona ponimus, licet substantia copulemus: illi, Sabellii dogma sectantes, Trinitatem in unius personæ angustias cogunt..... Aperta est convincenda blasphemia dicentium, Deum primum voluisse in Veteri Testamento per Moysem et Prophetas salvare mundum: sed quia non potuerit explere, corpus sumpsisse de Virgine, et, in Christo sub specie Filii prædicantem, mortem obiisse pro nobis. Et quia per duos gradus mundum salvare nequiverit, ad extremum per Spiritum Sanctum in Montanum, Priscillam, [al. Priscam,] et Maximillam insanas fœminas descendisse: et plenitudinem, quam Paulus non habuerit,.... abscissum et semivirum habuisse Montanum.

[22] Hæret. Fabul. l. 3. c. 2. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 341.) Τὸν περὶ τῆς θείας Τριάδος οὐκ ἐλυμήνατο λόγον.

[23] Vid. C. Constant. 1. c. 7. See n. 20, preceding.—Conf. C. Trull. c. 95. (t. 6. p. 1182 e.) where the same words occur.

Sabellius, were liable to the same censure: so that upon all accounts it must be concluded, they had made innovations upon the form of baptism received in the Catholic Church.

Fifthly, by the Marcosians.

8. Another very strange form was conceived by the Marcosians, or Marcites, so called from one Marcus, a sorcerer, who taught his disciples to baptize in the name of the Unknown Father[24] of all things, in the name of Truth, the mother of all things, and in Jesus, who descended (or, as Eusebius[25] reads it, *in him who descended into Jesus*) for the union, and redemption, and communion of the principalities or powers; or, in the union and redemption and communion of these powers: for it may be so understood, as if the names of these powers were taken into their form of baptism. But Irenæus[26], and Epiphanius[27] from him, tell us they had several forms of baptism, and some of them added certain hard Hebrew names to astonish their catechumens and converts, which the inquisitive reader may find in those writers. And some of them wholly rejected baptism as useless, because the mysteries of the ineffable and invisible power were not to be performed by visible and corruptible creatures, nor intellectual and incorporeal things by those that are sensible and corporeal; but the knowledge of the ineffable greatness was a perfect redemption: and in this they agreed with the Ascodrutæ, of whom we have spoken in the first section[28] of the last Chapter.

Sixthly, by the Paulianists.

9. The Paulianists, or followers of Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch, who denied the divinity of Christ, seem also to have been guilty of introducing a new form of baptism, though I do not remember any ancient writer that tells us particularly what it was. But St. Austin[29] concludes it must be so, because the Council of Nice made an order to receive

[24] Hæret. Fabul. l. 1. c. 9. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 301.) Εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς ἀλήθειαν μητέρα πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα, εἰς Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἕνωσιν καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων.

[25] L. 4. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 156. 16.)... Εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα, εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

[26] L. 1. c. 18. n. 2. (p. 89. 25.) Ἀλλοὶ δὲ Ἑβραϊκὰ τινὰ ὀνόματα ἐπιλέγουσι πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καταπλήξασθαι τοὺς τελειουμένους, οὕτως· Βασεμὰ, Χαμοσσὴ, Βααιανορὰ, κ. τ. λ.

[27] Hær. 34. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 236.) [But this citation is indistinct. See ibid. n. 20. Ed.]

[28] See n. 51. p. 15.

[29] De Hæres. c. 44. (t. 8. p. 13 d.) Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in Ecclesia Catholica Nicæno Concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est, eos regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi hæretici, cum de Catholica discederent, abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.

them only by a new baptism into the Church: which he takes to be an argument that the Paulianists 'had not kept to the form or rule of baptism, which many other heretics, when they left the Church, took along with them, and continued still to observe.' Pope Innocent[29] likewise assigns this for the reason why the Council of Nice allowed the baptism of the Novatians, but not the Paulianists; because the Paulianists did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but the Novatians in their baptism always made use of those venerable names, as being, in point of the divine power of the Holy Trinity, always asserters of the Catholic faith.

Seventhly, by the Eunomians and others, who baptized into the death of Christ.

10. Another sort of heretics there were, who instead of 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' used this form, 'I baptize thee into the death of Christ.' Among the Apostolical Canons there is one[30] that particularly reflects upon this as an unlawful practice: 'If any bishop or presbyter use not three immersions in the celebration of baptism, but one only given in the death of Christ, let him be deposed; for our Lord did not say, "Baptize into my death:" but, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."' St. Paul indeed sometimes speaks of 'being baptized into the death of Christ;' but then, as Origen[31] has

[29] Ep. 22. ad Episcopos Macedon. c. 5. (CC. t. 2. p. 1275 b.) Idcirco distinctum esse ipsis duabus hæresibus ratio manifesta declarat: Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti minime baptizant [al. baptizabant]: et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant: nec apud istos de unitate potestatis divinæ, hoc est, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, quæstio aliquando mota est. Et ideo, omnibus segregatis, hæc sola electa est, cui istud crederent concedendum, quia nihil in Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti sacramento peccarent.

[30] C. 50. [Labb. 49.] (Cotel. [c. 42.] v. 1. p. 444.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελέση, ἀλλὰ ἓν βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω, οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος, Εἰς τὸν θάνατόν μου βαπτίσατε· ἀλλὰ, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.*

[31] In Rom. 6, 3. p. 540. [al. In Rom. l. 5. n. 8.] (t. 4. p. 561 c.) Requiras etiam fortassis hoc, quod cum ipse Dominus dixerit ad discipulos, ut baptizarent omnes gentes in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, cur hic Apostolus solius Christi in baptismo nomen assumpserit, dicens, *Quicunque baptizati sumus in Christo,* quum utique non habeatur legitimum baptisma, nisi sub nomine Trinitatis. Sed intuere prudentiam Pauli, quoniam quidem in præsenti loco non tam baptismatis rationem, quam mortis Christi discutere cupiebat ad cujus nos similitudinem etiam suaderet mori debere peccato, et consepeliri Christo. Et non erat utique conveniens, ut, ubi de morte dicebat, vel Patrem nominaret, vel Spiritum Sanctum. *Verbum enim caro factum est:* et

rightly observed, 'this does not denote any new form of baptism; for no other form of baptism was ever thought lawful, beside that which was given in the name of the Trinity, according to the command of Christ: and the Apostle is not speaking of the manner of baptizing, but of Christ's death, and our conforming to it, as signified in baptism; where it would not have been convenient to have said, *As many of us as have been baptized in the name of the Father, or of the Holy Ghost, have been baptized into his death:* and therefore the Apostle in prudence omitted them in that place, because it was not proper to mention either Father or Holy Ghost where he was speaking of death, which did not belong to them, but only to Christ incarnate.' Notwithstanding this just observation of Origen's, Eunomius the Arian revived this irregular practice of those ancient heretics, and cast off the old form of baptism, to make way for others more agreeable to his damnable errors and opinions. For, because he denied the divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost, he would no longer use the trine immersion, nor baptize in the name of the Trinity, but only into the death of Christ, as Socrates[32] gives an account of his practice.

Epiphanius[33] observes of the Anomœans, who were the peculiar followers of Eunomius, that they baptized also in another form, 'in the name of the uncreated God, and the name of the created God, and the name of the sanctifying Spirit, created by the created Son.' And so stiff were they to this form of their own inventing, that they baptized not only the Catholics, but all other sects, and even the Arians themselves, who had been otherwise baptized before them. And

merito, ubi caro est, ibi de morte tractatur. Nec conveniebat, ut diceret, *Quicunque baptizati sumus in nomine Patris, vel in nomine Spiritus Sancti, in morte ipsius baptizati sumus.* Unde observanda est, ex hoc loco etiam in cæteris consuetudo Apostoli, quod non semper, quum aliquid ex Scripturis assumit, integrum textum verborum, ut in suo loco positus est, assumit; sed ea tantum, quæ præsentis causæ requirit assertio, sicut et in præsenti sermone, quia de morte Christi docere cupiebat, sufficit ei dicere, *Quicunque baptizati sumus in Christo, in morte ipsius baptizati sumus.*

[32] L. 5. c. 24. (v. 2. p. 301. 42.) ....Πλὴν ὅτι τὸ βάπτισμα παρεχάραξαν· οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὴν Τριάδα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτίζουσι θάνατον.

[33] Hær. 76. Anomœan. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 992 b.) Ἀναβαπτίζει γὰρ τοὺς ἤδη βαπτισθέντας, οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐρχομένους, καὶ αἱρέσεων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν· ἀναβαπτίζει δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα Θεοῦ ἀκτίστου, καὶ εἰς ὄνομα Υἱοῦ κεκτισμένου, καὶ εἰς ὄνομα Πνεύματος ἁγιαστικοῦ, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κεκτισμένου Υἱοῦ κτισθέντος.

Gregory Nyssen tells us from Eunomius's own books, that he perverted the law of Christ, the law or tradition of the divine institution, and taught[34], that baptism was 'not to be given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as Christ commanded his disciples when he first delivered the mystery, but in the name of the Creator and Maker, and not Father only, but God of the Only-begotten.' Upon which he charges him with adding to the word of God, and corrupting it, because no such words as Creator or Maker of the Only-begotten, or the Son's being a creature, or the servant of God, were to be found in the words of the first institution.

Whether all the Arians were guilty of the same innovation.

11. But now this innovation was peculiar to the disciples of Eunomius, though Baronius[35] and some other learned men bring the charge against the Arians in general, upon the mistaken authority of Athanasius and St. Jerom. Athanasius[36] says they baptized 'in a Creator and a creature;' and St. Jerom[37] 'that they believed in the Father, the only true God,

[34] Cont. Eunom. l. 11. (t. 2. p. 706 c.) . . . . Μὴ εἰς Πατέρα τε καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καθὼς ἐνετείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραδιδοὺς τὸ μυστήριον, ἀλλ' εἰς δημιουργὸν καὶ κτιστὴν, καὶ οὐ μόνον Πατέρα φησὶ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν.

[35] An. 325. n. 88. (t. 3. p. 317 b.) Admiratione res digna est, considerare quibus dolis atque vafricie idem [humani generis hostis Diabolus] Christianam religionem, quam opera tot imperatorum extinguere non potuerat, unius hominis arte pessundare ac penitus abolere studuerit, dum divinum mysterium, baptismum, inquam, quo omnes consignantur ac nominantur pariter Christiani, Arii hæresi auferre molitus est. Athanasii enim hæc justa est querela, dum ait: 'Ariani autem in periculum veniunt, ne amittant integritatem mysterii: loquor autem de baptismate. Si enim in nomine Patris et Filii datur perfectio, plenaque initiatio: Patrem autem verum illi non pronunciant, eo quod negent aliquid ex ipso existere, et similem esse illius substantiæ; negantque verum Filium, aliumque ex non entibus conditum sibi comminiscentes in baptismate proferunt: qui, quæso, igitur non plane vanum ac inutile fuerit baptisma, quod ab illis datur, cum non nisi species sit et inane simulacrum, ipsique ea re nihil solidæ opis afferant ad pietatem? Non enim in Patre et Filio tribuunt baptisma Ariani, sed in Creatore et creatura, Factore et factura, &c.' En vides, quibus cuniculis una simul et idololatriam in ecclesiam introducere, et ab ea auferre sacrum baptisma per Arium hostis humani generis nisus sit; ut merito fuerit Porphyrio comparandus; nisi quod in hoc Arius illo deterior, dum Porphyrius aperte, comparatis undique muralibus machinis, quatere tentavit Christianam religionem; hic vero proditione, sub nomine Christiano, dolose eam prorsus perdere conatus est.

[36] Orat. 3. [al. 4.] cont. Arian. t. 1. p. 413. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 413.) Εἰς κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα, καὶ εἰς ποίημα καὶ ποιητήν.

[37] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. 9.] (t. 2. p. 181 b.) Arianus, cum nihil aliud crediderit . . nisi in Patre solo vero Deo, et in Jesu Christo Salvatore creatura, et in Spiritu Sancto utriusque servo, quomodo Spiritum Sanctum ab ecclesia recipiet, qui necdum peccatorum remissionem consecutus est?

in Jesus Christ the Saviour and a creature, and in the Holy Ghost, the servant of them both.' But they do not say that the Arians used this form of baptism; but only that their baptism, though it was given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was in effect no more than if it had been given in the name of a creature, because they believed the Son and Holy Ghost to be no more than creatures. The Arians corrupted the faith, but they still retained the Catholic form of baptism, till Eunomius brought in another form among them. And that is the true reason why both the first general Council of Constantinople[38] and the Council of Trullo[39] ordered the Eunomians to be rebaptized, at the same time that they appointed the other Arians to be received by imposition of hands only, without a new baptism. And the second Council of Arles made a like decree[40] concerning the Bonosiaci, or followers of Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, who were a branch of the Arians, 'that, because they retained baptism in the Catholic form, as they there say the other Arians did, therefore it should be sufficient, after the confession of a true faith, to receive them with chrism and imposition of hands without a new baptism.' Which is demonstration, that neither the ancient Arians before Eunomius, nor the Bonosians after him, had made any alteration in this matter; but though they had corrupted the faith, yet they retained the ancient form of baptizing used in the Catholic Church. For had it been otherwise, there is no question to be made but that, as Suicerus[41] out of Vossius[42] has

[38] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 b.) *Εὐνομιανοὺς μέντοι, τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτιζομένους, ... οὕτως καταχοῦμεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς χρονίζειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀκροᾶσθαι τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζομεν.*

[39] C. 95. (t. 6. p. 1182 d.) The same words.

[40] C. 17. (t. 4. p. 1013 b.) Bonosiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes (quos, sicut Arianos, baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est) dum [al. si] interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, chrismate et manus impositione in ecclesia recipi sufficit.

[41] Thes. Eccles. (t. 1. p. 638. *η.*) Ad baptismi formulam, ab Arianis usurpatam in genere quod attinet, eruditis quibusdam viris, ut cl. Vossius monet, Disputat. 2. de Baptismo, thesi 5., persuasum est, eos ex impio dogmate suo formulæ baptismi quædam adjecisse. Ut ita sentiant, adducuntur verbis Athanasii, Orat. 3. contra Arianos, [See n. 36, preceding.] et Hieronymi adversus Luciferianos, [See n. 37, preceding.] At si formula ejusmodi, his verbis concepta, eos usos fuisse vellent, eorum etiam baptismum, ut *κίβδηλον*, ecclesia orthodoxa rejecisset, et ab iis ad orthodoxos accedentes rebaptizasset: id vero non fuisse factum, supra in voce *αἱρετικὸς*, num. 4., ex antiquitate demonstravimus. Quid igitur Patres isti volunt? Hoc tantum, cum verba intelligenda sint ex

rightly observed, the ancient Councils would have rejected their baptism, as they did the Eunomians', and ordered them to have been rebaptized upon their return to the Catholic Church. For the observation of the form of baptism was always esteemed so necessary a part of the institution, and so essential to the sacrament, that where it was wanting the baptism was reputed an imperfect and void baptism, and to be repeated by all the rules made against heretics in the Catholic Church.

Whether any additions were made to the form of baptism in the Catholic Church.

12. There is one question more relating to the form of baptism, which it may not be improper to resolve in this place; that is, whether any additions were ever allowed to be made to the form of baptism in the Catholic Church? Some learned persons are of opinion, that such additions, when they were only by way of explication, and greater illustration, to confirm the truth against heretics, were used in the form of baptism, as well as in the Creed. But I think Vossius, upon better grounds of reason and authority, more judiciously determines the contrary. Two authors are commonly alleged in favour of their assertion, viz. Justin Martyr and the Author of the Constitutions, but neither of them comes fully up to the thing intended. For Justin Martyr[43], as Vossius observes, is only giv-

animo dicentis,—quamvis Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum nominent Ariani, tamen id tantumdem esse, ac si baptizare se dicant *in nomen creaturæ;* utpote qui Christum dicunt *κτίσμα* et *ποίημα*.

[42] De Bapt. disput. 2. thes. 5. p. 54. (t. 6. p. 264.) Etiam Arianos ex impio dogmate suo formulæ quædam adjicere solere; et Catholicos item, ad explicationem ejus, quædam adjicere solere consuevisse; eruditis aliquot viris persuasum esse video. De Arianis, auctores sententiæ suæ laudant magnum Athanasium, Orat. 3. cont. Arianos, et B. Hieronymum adversus Luciferanos: quibus in locis Athanasius quidem ait, *Εἰς κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα, εἰς ποίημα καὶ ποιητήν*: Hieronymus vero dicit, *Baptizare eos in Patre solo vero Deo, et in Jesu Christo Salvatore creatura, et in Spiritu Sancto utriusque servo.* Sed non assecuti sunt Patrum horum mentem. Nam si hoc vellent, hæreticos istos ejusmodi formula usos esse, quorsum attinebat, Athanasium non ostendere, nihil referre, si Ariani, Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti nomina retineant; cum aliter ea, quam ecclesia, intelligant? vel quo pacto Hieronymus ibidem eo pugnaret argumento, quod Luciferiani non minus, quam Catholici, reciperent baptizatos ab Arianis? aut qua fronte Hilarium, urbis diaconum, exagitaret, quod dogmate de rebaptizandis, qui ab Arianis venirent, orbem alioqui periturum servare sibi videbatur; unde *Deucalion orbis* ab Hieronymo ibidem appellatur? Quare illud solum Patres isti volunt, cum verba intelligi oporteat ex animo dicentis; utut Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum nominent Ariani; tamen id tantumdem esse, ac si baptizare se dicant in nomen creaturæ: quippe qui Christum habeant pro mera creatura.

[43] Apol. 2. n. 80. (p. 94 a.) *Ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡ-*

ing a paraphrastical explication of the words used in baptism for the instruction of the Heathens, to whom he is writing, when he tells them how the Christians baptized in the name of the Father of all things, who was Lord and God, and in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, and of the Holy Ghost. And the Author of the Constitutions[44] is yet more plain: for, first of all, he tells every bishop and presbyter, that they ought to baptize precisely in that form of words which our Lord enjoined us, when he said, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you." And then he goes on to explain the several names of the three Persons concerned, viz. 'that the Father is the Person who sent, Christ the Person who came, and the Paraclete or Comforter the Person who bears witness.' So that this was plainly an explication or paraphrase of the form of baptism only, and not the very form that was then in use. Nor can it be made appear, that ever the Catholic Church varied from the form delivered by our Saviour, though Vossius[45] thinks a form with such an orthodox addition would not destroy the essence of baptism, as those heretical forms certainly do, which corrupt the truth of the Catholic faith.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the subjects of baptism, or an account of what persons were anciently allowed to be baptized. Where particularly of infant-baptism.

Why the question

1. Having spoken of the matter and form of baptism, I should

μῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται.

[44] L. 7. c. 22. [Labb. 23.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 368.) . . . . Οὕτω βαπτίσεις, ὡς ὁ Κύριος διετάξατο ἡμῖν, λέγων, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίσαντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, . . . τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος Πατρὸς, τοῦ ἐλθόντος Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος Παρακλήτου.

[[45] De Bapt. disput. 2. thes. 5. p. 55. (v. 6. p. 265.) Sed tamen demus istud viris illis eruditis, tum Arianos, tum Catholicos, iis, quas dicunt, formulis uti solere. Sane sic Arianorum quidem baptismus, qui de hæresi aliquid adjungit formulæ, non erit verus baptismus, cum proposito id Christi e diametro adversetur, ut quis in creaturæ baptizetur nomen. Catholicorum vero baptismus, qui tantum explicationis causa apponit aliquid, nihilo secius baptismus erit; quia sententiam formulæ reservat. *Grischov.*]

now have considered the persons by whom this sacrament was anciently administered; but because I have lately had occasion to handle this subject fully in a scholastical way in two distinct Discourses[46], it will be sufficient in this place to give this summary account of the matter. There I have showed, that bishops, as the Apostles' successors, were the persons chiefly entrusted with this power; that they granted power to presbyters to baptize in ordinary cases; to deacons sometimes in ordinary, and sometimes only in extraordinary cases; to laymen only in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity; that the usurped baptism of laymen was allowed to be valid, so far as not to need repeating, though given irregularly; that the baptism of women was wholly prohibited; that the baptism of Jews and Infidels was never allowed, though now accepted in the Church of Rome; that the baptism of heretics and schismatics was disannulled by the Cyprianists, and some few others, who required a true faith, as well as a true form, to make a complete baptism; but that this opinion was rejected by the great body of the Catholic Church, who thought the defects of heretical baptism might be supplied by imposition of hands without rebaptizing; that yet it was agreed, both by the Cyprianists and all others whatsoever, that heretics and schismatics had not the power of priests, because some of them, as the Novatians, never had a just and legal call to the priesthood; and others were deprived of their power by the lawful authority of the Church, which first committed that power to them; that thenceforward they were reputed, not true Christian priests, but wolves and antichrists, instead of true shepherds and governors of the flock of Christ; that the Church had power, not only to suspend the execution of their office, but to cancel their commission, and wholly take away the power and authority of the priesthood from them; and then they were reduced to the state and condition of laymen; and sometimes they were not only degraded from the priesthood, but thrust down one degree below laymen, by being anathematized and cast out of the communion of the Church: and yet, notwithstanding all this, the Church did not think fit to cancel or wholly disannul the

about the administrators of baptism is here omitted.

[46] The First and Second Parts of the Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, originally published in 1712 and 1714, and now forming the ninth volume of this edition. Ed.]

baptisms given by such men, though given by usurpation and without any authority of the priesthood, so long as it appeared they were given in due form, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. All which things being abundantly proved in the two foresaid Discourses, I think it not proper to repeat or insist any longer upon them; but shall now proceed, as the order of the discourse requires, to consider the persons on whom baptism was anciently conferred.

Who were anciently reckoned the proper subjects of baptism. Where, of the corrupt custom of baptizing inanimate things, as bells in the Roman Church.

2. And here, first of all, it is certain, that none but living persons, whether adult or infants, and that in their own personal capacity, were ever reckoned subjects capable of baptism in the primitive Church. The Ancients knew nothing of that profane custom of giving baptism to inanimate things, as bells and the like, by a superstitious consecration of them. The first notice we have of this is in the Capitulars of Charles the Great[47], where it is only mentioned to be censured: but afterward it crept into the Roman Offices by degrees, (as I have noted in another place[48] out of Baronius, Cardinal Bona, and Menardus,) till at last it grew to that superstitious height, as to be thought proper to be complained of in the *Centum Gravamina* of the German nation, drawn up in the public diet of the empire held at Norimberg, [or Nuremburgh], anno 1518; where[49], after having described the ceremony of baptizing a bell with godfathers, who make responses, as in baptism, and give it a name, and clothe it with a new garment, as Christians were used to be clothed, and all this to make it capable of driving away tempests and devils, they conclude against it, 'as not only a superstitious practice, but contrary to the Christian religion, and a mere seduction of the simple people, and an exaction upon them: for which reason, they declare, so wicked and unlawful a custom ought to be abolished.' He that would see more of this, may consult Hospinian[50], or Wolfius[51], or

[47] Cited by Durantus, De Ritibus &c., l. 1. c. 22. n. 2. (p. 72.)... Ut clocas non baptizent.

[48] B. 8. ch. 7. s. 15. v. 3. p. 146.

[49] Cent. Gravam. n. 51. in Fascicul. Rer. Expetend. (t. 1. p. 366.)... Quæ res non solum superstitiosa, sed etiam Christianæ religioni contraria, ac simpliciorum seductio, et mera est exactio. Res igitur tam nefanda et illicita merito aboleri debet.

[50] De Templis, l. 4. c. 9. p. 113. (p. 391.) De Consecratione Campanarum.

[51] Lection. Memorab. centur. 16. an. 1550. (t. 2. p. 595. col. sinistr. im.) Propterea perquam prudenter

Sleidan[52], who describe the ceremony at large out of the old Romish Pontifical; for I must return to the primitive Church.

3. And here we meet with a practice a little more ancient, but not less superstitious than the former: which was a custom, that began to prevail among some weak people in Afric, of giving baptism to the dead. The third Council of Carthage[53] speaks of it, as a thing that ignorant Christians were a little fond of, and therefore gives a seasonable caution against it, to discourage the practice: and this is again repeated in the African Code[54]. Gregory Nazianzen[55] also takes notice of the same superstitious opinion prevailing among some who delayed to be baptized. In his address to this kind of men, he asks them 'Whether they stayed to be baptized after death?' and doubts upon this account 'whether to esteem them greater objects of pity or contempt.' Philastrius[56] also notes it as the general error of the Montanists or Cataphrygians, that they baptized men after death. The practice seems to be grounded upon a vain opinion, that when men had neglected to receive

Baptism not to be given to the dead.

et pie Cæsar Maximilianus inter gravamina sedis Romanæ, a Germanis non toleranda, campanarum consecrationem recensuit in hæc verba: 'Suffraganei excogitaverunt, ut solum ipsi, et nullus alius sacerdos, laicis campanas baptizarent. Credunt deinde simpliciores, ita affirmantibus suffraganeis, tales campanas baptizatas dæmones et tempestates pellere. Quaprŏpter innumeri plerumque adhibentur compatres, præcipue vero, qui fortuna pollent, exorantur, qui baptizationis tempore funem, quo campana ligata est, tangunt, ac suffraganeo præcinente, quemadmodum in parvulorum baptizatione fieri solet, omnes pariter respondent, ac campanæ nomen ingeminant; vesteque nova, quemadmodum et Christianis fieri solet, campana induitur. Inde ad sumptuosa properatur convivia, quibus præcipue compatres, ut eo largius munera offerant, adhibentur; nec non suffraganei, et eorum capellani, cum multis aliis ministris, regaliter pascuntur. Nec hoc satis est, sed et suffraganeo mercedem persolvere necesse est, quam illi munusculum vocare solent. Inde evenit, ut aliquando, etiam in parvis villis, centum floreni in tali absumantur et expendantur baptizatione. Quæ res non solum superstitiosa, sed etiam Christianæ religioni contraria, ac simpliciorum seductio, et mera est exactio. Verum etiam episcopi, ut suffraganeos vel vilissima obærare possint mercede, talia et adhuc absurdiora tolerant. Res igitur tam nefanda et illicita merito aboleri debet.'

[52] Comment. l. 21. p. 388. (p. 608. sub im.) See before, b. 8. ch. 7. s. 15. v. 3. p. 147. n. 56.

[53] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 1168 a.) Cavendum est etiam, ne mortuos baptizari posse fratrum infirmitas credat.

[54] C. 18. (ibid. p. 1058 e.) Μὴ τοὺς ἤδη τελευτῶντας βαπτισθῆναι ποιήσῃ ἡ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἄγνοια.

[55] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 648 a.) . . . . Ἢ καὶ σὺ μένεις νεκρὸς λουθῆναι; Οὐ μᾶλλον ἐλεούμενος ἢ μισούμενος;

[56] De Hæres. c. 2. [al. 21.] de Cataphryg. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 488 d.) Hi mortuos baptizant, &c.

baptism in their lifetime, some compensation might be made for this default by receiving it after death. And for the same reason they gave the eucharist also to the dead in the like circumstances, which is equally condemned in the forementioned African Canons, as proceeding from gross ignorance in some presbyters, and want of a due understanding of the true intent and meaning of those holy institutions; for whose information they order provincial councils to be held twice a year, that they might be better instructed.

Nor to the living for the dead. Where, of the Apostle's meaning of being baptized for the dead, 1Cor.15,29.

4. Another absurd practice, prevailing among some of the ancient heretics, was *a sort of vicarious baptism*, which was, that when any one died without baptism, another was baptized in his stead. St. Chrysostom[57] tells us this was practised among the Marcionites with a great deal of ridiculous ceremony, which he thus describes: 'After any catechumen was dead, they hid a living man under the bed of the deceased; then coming to the dead man, they spake to him, and asked him whether he would receive baptism? and he making no answer, the other answered for him, and said he would be baptized in his stead; and so they baptized the living for the dead, as if they were acting a comedy upon the stage, so great was the power of Satan in the minds of these vain men.' Afterward, when any one challenged them upon this practice, they had the confidence to plead the Apostle's authority for it, "Why are they then baptized for the dead?" Against which St. Chrysostom urges very well, 'that if this were allowed, in vain had God threatened those that died unbaptized: for by this means any Jew or Gentile might easily be made a Christian

[57] Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 688. (t. 10. p. 378 c.) Ἐπειδὰν γάρ τις κατηχούμενος ἀπέλθῃ παρ' αὐτοῖς, τὸν ζῶντα ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην τοῦ τετελευτηκότος κρύψαντες, προσίουσι τῷ νεκρῷ, καὶ διαλέγονται, καὶ πυνθάνονται, Εἰ βούλοιτο λαβεῖν τὸ βάπτισμα; Εἶτα ἐκείνου μηδὲν ἀποκρινομένου, ὁ κεκρυμμένος κάτωθεν ἀντ' ἐκείνου φησὶν, ὅτι δὴ βούλοιτο βαπτισθῆναι· καὶ οὕτω βαπτίζουσιν αὐτὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπελθόντος, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς παίζοντες. Τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσε ταῖς τῶν ῥαθύμων ψυχαῖς ὁ διάβολος. Εἶτα ἐγκαλούμενοι, τουτὶ παράγουσι τὸ ῥῆμα λέγοντες, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος εἴρηκεν, Οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν'. . . Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἔλεγε Παῦλος, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἠπείλησεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ μὴ βαπτιζομένῳ; οὐ γάρ ἐστί τινα μὴ βαπτισθῆναι λοιπὸν, ἐπινοηθέντος τούτου· ἄλλως δὲ τὸ ἔγκλημα οὐκέτι παρὰ τὸν ἀπελθόντα γίνεται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸν ζῶντα. . . . Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐφεῖται, καὶ οὐ χρεία γνώμης τῆς τοῦ λαμβάνοντος, οὐδὲ συγκαταθέσεως τῆς ἐν τῷ ζῆν, τί κωλύει καὶ Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαίους οὕτω γενέσθαι πιστοὺς, ἑτέρων μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν ἐκείνων ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων ταῦτα ποιούντων.

by having another after his death baptized for him.' Tertullian[58] brings the same charge against the Marcionites, comparing their practice to the heathen lustrations for the dead upon the Kalends of February; but he tells them, 'they did but in vain allege the Apostle's authority for this practice, as if he had argued from it for the truth and confirmation of the resurrection: for the Apostle speaks of but one baptism, and that was of the living for themselves.' He reflects upon the same practice in another place[59], where he calls it 'the vicarious baptism, which some used in hopes of the resurrection.'

Suicerus[60] thinks the Cerinthians were the first authors of this kind of baptism, and that indeed would carry it up to the Apostles' time. But Epiphanius[61], on whose authority he depends, says no such thing, as from any certain proof, or his own judgment, but only 'that there was an uncertain tradition handed down to them concerning some heretics in Asia in the Apostles' days, who, when any one died without baptism, substituted another in his room, to be baptized for him, lest in the resurrection he should be punished for want of baptism, and be subjected to the powers which made the world. And the same tradition asserted that the Apostle hence took occasion to say, "If the dead rise not, why are they then baptized for the dead?"' But Epiphanius wholly rejects this opinion; nor do we find any of the Ancients so interpreting this passage of the

[58] Cont. Marcion. l. 5. c. 10. (p. 473 a.) Viderit institutio ista, Kalendæ si forte Februariæ respondebunt illi pro mortuis petere. Noli ergo Apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem ejus denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem, quanto illi, qui vane pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc facerent. Habemus illum alicubi unius baptismi definitorem.

[59] De Resurrect. Carn. c. 48. (p. 355 a) Si autem et baptizantur quidam pro mortuis, videbimus an ratione. Certe illa præsumptione hoc eos instituisse contendit, qua alii etiam carni [ut] vicarium baptisma profuturum existimarent ad spem resurrectionis.

[60] [Thes. Eccles. voce Βάπτισμα, 5. c. δ. (t. 1. p. 642.) Alii *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν βαπτίζεσθαι* interpretantur *loco et vice mortuorum baptizari;* quod faciebant superstites illi, qui pro amicis sine baptismo mortuis sese curabant baptizandos. Hunc morem Epiphanius, &c. See the next note. Ed.]

[61] Hær. 28. Cerinth. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 114 b.) *Ἐν οἷς καί τι παραδόσεως πρᾶγμα ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡς τινῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς προφθανόντων τελευτῆσαι ἄνευ βαπτίσματος, ἄλλους δὲ ἀντ' αὐτῶν εἰς ὄνομα ἐκείνων βαπτίζεσθαι, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἀναστάντας αὐτοὺς δίκην δοῦναι τιμωρίας, βάπτισμα μὴ εἰληφότας, γίνεσθαι δὲ ὑποχειρίους τῆς τοῦ κοσμοποιοῦ ἐξουσίας· καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα ἡ παράδοσις ἡ ἐλθοῦσα εἰς ἡμᾶς, φησι, τὸν αὐτὸν ἅγιον Ἀπόστολον εἰρηκέναι, Εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν;*

Apostle, except only the author under the name of St. Ambrose[61], who is clearly of opinion that the Apostle had respect to such a custom then in being, and thence drew an argument from the example of those, who were so firmly persuaded of the truth of the future resurrection, that when any one among them was prevented by sudden death, they had another to be baptized in his name, fearing lest he should either not rise at all, or rise to condemnation. But St. Chrysostom gives a much more rational account of the Apostle's argument; for he supposes him to refer to the Catholic custom of making every catechumen at his baptism with his own mouth declare his belief of the resurrection of the dead, by repeating the Creed, of which that was a part, and so being baptized into that faith, or hope of the resurrection of the dead. And therefore he puts them in mind of this, saying[62], 'If there be no resurrection of the dead, why art thou then baptized for the dead, that is, the body? For therefore thou art baptized for the dead, believing the resurrection of the dead, that the body may not remain dead, but revive again.' So that *baptizing for the dead* is an elliptical expression, for being baptized into the faith or belief of the resurrection of the dead. And so I think Tertullian[63] is to be understood, when he says, in opposition to the error of the Marcionites, 'that to be baptized for the dead, is to be baptized for the body which is declared to be dead by baptism:' that is, we are baptized into the belief of the resurrection of the body, both whose death and resurrection are represented in baptism. And the interpretation of Epiphanius[64]

[61] In 1 Cor. 15, 29. (t. 2. append. p. 163 f.) In tantum ratam et stabilem vult ostendere resurrectionem mortuorum, ut exemplum det eorum, qui tam securi erant de futura resurrectione, ut etiam pro mortuis baptizarentur. Si quem forte mors prævenisset, timentes, ne aut male, aut non resurgeret, qui baptizatus non fuerat, vivus nomine mortui tingebatur.

[62] Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 689. (t. 10. p. 379 c.) Εἰ μὴ ἔστιν ἀνάστασις, τί καὶ βαπτίζῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, τουτέστι, τῶν σωμάτων; καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦτο βαπτίζῃ, τοῦ νεκροῦ σώματος ἀνάστασιν πιστεύων, ὅτι οὐκέτι μένει νεκρόν.

[63] Cont. Marcion. l. 5. c. 10. (p. 473 b.) Igitur et pro mortuis tingui, pro corporibus est tingui; mortuum enim corpus ostendimus. Quid enim facient, qui pro corporibus baptizantur, si corpora non resurgunt?

[64] Hær. 28. Cerinth. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 114 c.) Καλῶς δὲ ἄλλοι τὸ ῥητὸν ἑρμηνεύοντές, φασιν, ὅτι οἱ μέλλοντες τελευτᾷν, ἐὰν ὦσι κατηχούμενοι, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ἐλπίδι πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς λουτροῦ καταξιοῦνται· δεικνύντες ὅτι ὁ τελευτήσας καὶ ἀναστήσεται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιδέεται τῆς διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων.

comes pretty near these when he says, 'it refers to those who were baptized upon the approach of death in hopes of the resurrection from the dead; for they showed thereby that the dead should rise again, and that therefore they had need of the remission of sins, which is obtained in baptism.' The same sense is given by Theodoret[65], and Theophylact[66], and Balsamon[67] and Zonaras, and Matthew Blastares[68], among the Greeks; and it is embraced by Bp. Patrick[69], and Dr. Hammond[70], as the most natural and genuine exposition of this difficult passage of the Apostle. Some indeed think it may refer to another custom of baptizing over the monuments of the martyrs, who died for the faith in hopes of a future resurrection. But that custom was hardly ancient enough to be alluded to in the time of the Apostles, though Vossius[71], and

[65] In 1 Cor. 15, 29. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 275.) Ὁ βαπτιζόμενός, φησι, τῷ δεσπότῃ συνθάπτεται, ἵνα τοῦ θανάτου κοινωνήσας, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γένηται κοινωνός· εἰ δὲ νεκρόν ἐστι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐκ ἀνίσταται, τί δήποτε καὶ βαπτίζεται;

[66] In eund. loc. (t. 2. p. 223 d. 61.) Οἱ μέλλοντες βαπτισθῆναι πάντες ἀπαγγέλλουσι τὸ σύμβολον τῆς πίστεως· ἐν οὖν τούτῳ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦτο πρόκειται, Πιστεύω εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν. Φησὶν οὖν ὅτι οἱ πιστεύσαντες, ὅτι ἔσται ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν σωμάτων, καὶ βαπτισθέντες ἐπὶ τοιαύταις ἐλπίσι, τί ποιήσουσιν ἀπατηθέντες;

[67] In c. 18. C. Carth. (ap. Bevereg. Pand. t. 1. p. 541 a.) Οὐ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι τοὺς ἀποθανόντας ὁ Ἀπόστολος λέγει, ἢ ἄλλους ἀντ' ἐκείνων· ἀλλ', ἐπεὶ οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι, μανθάνοντες τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς μυστηρίου τὴν δύναμιν, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν ἐλπίζειν διδάσκονται, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ κατάδυσιν τὸν θάνατον παραδηλοῦν, τὴν δὲ ἀνάστασιν αὖθις διὰ τῆς ἀναδύσεως ὑπεμφαίνεσθαι, φησὶν ὁ Ἀπόστολος πρὸς τοὺς ἀμφιβαλόντας περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, Ὅτι εἰ μὴ ἀνάστασίς ἐστι, τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ ἀναστῆναι τοὺς νεκρούς; καὶ τί βαπτίζονται, ὡς προσδοκῶντες νεκρῶν ἀναζώωσιν; Λοιπὸν ματαιοπονοῦσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι, εἴγε περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀμφιβάλλουσι διὰ μὲν τοῦ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι εἰς τὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας ὕδωρ καὶ ἀναδύεσθαι, τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν καταγγέλλοντες, δι' ὧν δὲ λέγουσιν, ἀπιστοῦντες αὐτῇ.

[68] Syntagm. Canon. (ap. Eund. ibid. part. 2. p. 41 e, f.) Οὐ τοὺς ἤδη τεθνηκότας ὁ Ἀπόστολος κελεύει βαπτίζειν, ἢ ἀντ' ἐκείνων ἄλλους·... Βαπτίζονται γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν τῇ φύσει σωμάτων, εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ αὐτὰ μετασκευασθῆναι πιστεύοντες.

[69] Aqua Genitalis, p. 453. (Lond. 1670. 8vo. pp. 32, 33.) Fourthly, We receive hereby a promise of resurrection, &c.

[70] In 1 Cor. 15. 29. (v. 3. p. 563.) See the paraphrase of the verse cited at p. 560... Why then have they at their baptism made profession of their belief of it [the resurrection], &c.

[71] Thes. Theolog. disput. 12. p. 225. thes. 18. (t. 6. p. 402.) Quo loco [1 Cor. 15, 29.] quamquam minime eorum sententiam damnamus, qui τὸ βαπτίζεσθαι (ut interdum sumitur) de afflictione intelligunt, ac τὸ ὑπὲρ (ut interdum accipi Eustathius docet) ἕνεκα vel ὑπὲρ exponunt; ut nempe intelligantur, qui eo persecutionem patiantur, quod obdormientes in Christo resurrecturos æternumque beate doceant victuros; tamen, cum τὸ βαπτίζεσθαι obscuriori hac notione raro admo-

some other learned men, incline to this opinion. However it be, it is not likely the Apostle would draw an argument from the absurd practice of the worst of heretics: therefore whatever interpretation be thought most proper and worthy to be received, that is certainly to be rejected, together with the error of the Marcionites, who founded their vicarious baptism upon the authority of this apostolical passage, contrary to the sense and practice of the whole Catholic Church, which never allowed of baptism given to the living for the dead, or of any baptism but such as was given to men in their own persons.

Proofs of infant-baptism from the ancient records of the Church.

5. Now of persons, who were reckoned capable of receiving baptism, there were two sorts, infants and adult persons. And infants were of two sorts, either such as were born of Christian parents, or such as were born of Heathens, but by some providential means became the possession and property, as I may call it, of the Christian Church; neither of which sort were excluded from baptism, when sufficient sponsors could be provided for them. This is so evident from the ancient records of the Church, that it is to be wondered, how some learned persons could run into the contrary opinion, and offer reasons from antiquity, in prejudice of the Church's constant practice. Mr. Wall, in his elaborate History of Infant-Baptism [72], has justly reflected upon abundance of these men, who, by their unwary concessions, have given too great advantage to the Anabaptists of this age. There are some others also, which he had not seen, who advance as unworthy notions of the

dum usurpetur in Scripturis, ac tum, unico Lucæ loco excepto, additam habeat ἐξήγησιν; magis placet hoc verbum proprie accipi, ac τὸ ὑπὲρ, ut sæpe fit, *super* seu *supra*, quod et inde descendit, significare: ut nempe sententia sit, *qui baptismi aqua tingui amant super cadavera, h. e. super sepulchra.* Quæ interpretatio eo confirmatur, quod non Hieronymi tantum vel Augustini ævo ad memoriam martyrum convenirent, quod nemo in dubium vocat; sed jam ætate eorum, qui Johannem Evangelistam audire potuissent: ut fratrum Smyrnensium literis ab Eusebio recitatis ostendimus thesibus historicis de Invocatione Sanctorum. Ut igitur jam antiquissimis ecclesiæ temporibus Christiani instituere amabant conventus sacros in martyrum cœmiteriis, quo fideles hoc pacto ad eorum sequendum exemplum magis inflammarentur; ita iisdem temporibus, ipsoque, ut videtur, Apostolorum ævo, gaudebant multi super martyrum aliorumque fidelium sepulchra baptizari, quo ita tum peccato se mori, tum et suam et eorum, super quibus baptizarentur, resurrectionem se credere hoc signo testarentur.

[72] See particularly part 2. ch. 2. (Oxf. 1836. v. 2. pp. 12, seqq.) *The opinions of modern learned men, concerning the ancient practice or omission of pædo-baptism.*

ancient practice; for Salmasius, and Suicerus[73] out of him, deliver it as authentic history, 'that for the two first ages no one received baptism, who was not first instructed in the faith and doctrine of Christ, so as to be able to answer for himself, that he believed, because of those words, "He that believeth and is baptized:" [Mark 16, 16.] which in effect is to say, that no infant for the two first ages was ever admitted to Christian baptism. But afterwards they own pædo-baptism came in, upon the opinion 'that baptism was necessary to salvation.'

Now I shall not think myself obliged to be very prolix in refuting this opinion, together with the false supposition which is made the foundation of it, since that has so often, and so substantially been done by Vossius[74], Dr. Forbes[75], Dr. Hammond[76], Mr. Walker[77], and especially Mr. Wall[78], who has exactly considered the testimony and authority of almost every ancient writer that has said any thing upon this subject. But that no one who reads these collections may be wholly at a loss for want of other authors, I shall here subjoin a brief account of the most pertinent authorities that occur in the three first ages.

From Clemens Romanus and Hermes Pastor.

6. The most ancient writer we have is Clemens Romanus, who lived in the time of the Apostles. And he, though he does not directly mention infant-baptism, yet says a thing that by consequence proves it. For he makes infants liable to original sin, which in effect is to say, that they have need of baptism to purge them from it; for speaking of Job[79], he says, 'though he was a just man, yet he condemns himself, saying, There is none free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.' Now if children be born in sin,

[73] Thes. Eccles. voce Σύναξις. (t. 2. p. 1136.) Primis duobus sæculis nemo baptismum accipiebat, nisi qui, in fide instructus, et doctrina Christi imbutus, testari posset se credere, propter illa verba, *Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit.* .... Postea opinio invaluit, *Neminem salvari posse, nisi qui baptizatus fuisset.*

[74] De Bapt. disput. 14. (t. 6. pp. 306, seqq.)

[75] Instruct. Hist. Theolog. l. 10. c. 5. (pp. 492, seqq.) De Baptismi necessitate, &c.

[76] Defence of Inf. Bapt. ch. 4. (v. 1. pp. 470, seqq.)

[77] Modest Plea, &c. ch. 27. (pp. 224, seqq.) *The Catholick Churches' custom to baptise infants.*

[78] See part 1. ch. 1, &c, [running through the first volume of the Work.] (v. 1. pp. 47, seqq.)

[79] Ep. 1. ad Corinth. n. 17. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 155.) .... Αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορῶν λέγει, Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. [See Job. 14, 4 and 5, according to the Septuagint (Ed. Lambert. Bos. Franequer. 1709. p. 699.) Τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου; ἀλλ' οὐθεὶς, ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Or, according to

they have need of a regeneration to make them capable of the kingdom of heaven.

Hermes Pastor lived about the same time with Clemens, and has several passages to show the general necessity of water, that is, baptism, to save men. In one place[79] he represents the Church as a tower built on the waters, and says, 'Hear therefore why the tower is built on waters; because your life is saved and shall be saved by water.' In another place[80] he makes water-baptism so necessary to all, that in a vision he represents the Apostles as going after death to baptize the holy spirits who lived under the Old Testament, that they might be translated into the kingdom of God. 'It was necessary,' says he, 'for them to ascend by water that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God, than by putting off the mortality of their former life. They therefore, after they were dead, were sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God: for before any one receives the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death; but when he receives that seal, he is delivered from death, and is assigned to life: now that seal is water, into which men descend bound over unto death, but ascend out of it assigned unto life. For this reason the seal was also preached unto them, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God.'

The plain design of this place is to represent the necessity of baptism, without which, none can ordinarily enter into the kingdom of God. And it cannot be doubted, that he who thought it so necessary, even for the Patriarchs, who died before the coming of Christ, must think it equally necessary to all those who lived under the dispensation of the Gospel. Though, whether the baptism here mentioned be to be understood in a literal

the Cod. Alexandr., Ἐὰν καὶ μίας ἡμέρας γένηται ὁ βίος. Ed.]

[79] L. 1. Vis. 3. n. 3. (ibid. p. 79.) Quare igitur super aquas ædificatur turris, audi. Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est et fiet.

[80] L. 3. simil. 9. n. 16. (ibid. 117.) Necesse est .... ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant: non poterant enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur a morte, et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo, ut intrarent in regnum Dei.

and corporeal sense, or only in a metaphorical or mystical way, as a vision or a parable may require, is what may admit of some dispute. And therefore Cotelerius [81] gives his opinion for the latter sense, concluding, that forasmuch as washing in water properly belongs to bodies and not to spirits, our author is necessarily to be understood of a metaphorical and mystical baptism, that is, the spiritual effects of it, the good things which are conferred by God in baptism, the chief of which is a title to eternal life, which the Patriarchs after death are supposed to be made partakers of by believing the word of the Gospel then preached to them. This was that spiritual water, in which departed souls were baptized, as the bodies of the living are baptized in common water; from the analogy of which we must needs conclude the necessity of water-baptism for all those who are in a capacity to receive it, that is, for all those who are yet in the body, in order to be made partakers of eternal life. God indeed may, if he pleases, give the baptism of the Spirit, and the baptism of faith, which is the baptism of the Word, without it: and so some of the Ancients suppose the Apostles to be baptized without water, from that saying of our Saviour, "Now ye are clean, through the word which I have spoken unto you." [Joh. 15, 3.] So Tertullian [82] and others:

[81] In loc. (ibid. n. 44.) Quandoquidem lavatio corporibus competit, non animis, noster necessario intelligit baptismum metaphoricum et mysticum, bona videlicet quæ in baptismate a Deo conceduntur.

[82] De Bapt. c. 12. (p. 228 d.) Quum vero præscribitur, nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illa maxime pronuntiatione Domini, qui ait, *Nisi natus ex aqua quis erit, non habet vitam,* suboriuntur scrupulosi, immo temerarii retractatus quorundam, quo modo ex ista præscriptione Apostolis salus competat, quos tinctos non invenimus in Domino, præter Paulum. Immo quum Paulus solus ex illis baptismum Christi induerit, aut præjudicatum esse de cæterorum periculo, qui careant aqua Christi, ut præscriptio salva sit, aut rescindi præscriptionem, si etiam non tinctis salus statuta est. Audivi, Domino teste, ejusmodi, ne quis me tam perditum existimet, ut ultro exagitem libidine [al. libidinem] styli, quæ aliis scrupulum incutiant. Et nunc illis, ut potero, respondebo, qui negant Apostolos tinctos. Nam si humanum Ioannis baptismum inierant, et dominicum desiderabant, quatenus unum baptismum definierat ipse Dominus, dicens Petro perfundi nolenti, *Qui semel lavit, non habet necesse rursum:* quod utique non tincto non omnino dixisset: et hæc est probatio exerta adversus illos, qui adimunt Apostolis etiam Ioannis baptismum; ut destruant aquæ sacramentum. An credibile videri potest, in his personis viam tunc Domini non præparatam, id est, baptismum Ioannis, quæ ad viam Domini per totum orbem aperiendam destinabantur? Ipse Dominus, nullius pœnitentiæ debitor, tinctus est: peccatoribus non fuit ne-

though the more general opinion[82] is, that they were baptized by Christ himself. In like manner God might dispense with the want of water-baptism in cases extraordinary, and supply this want either by martyrdom, or faith and repentance, in such cases where it could not be had; as I have showed, in the last Book[83], the general consent of the Ancients upon this matter to be. But yet in all ordinary cases, where water-baptism might be had, they concluded as generally for the necessity of it, from that assertion of our Saviour, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." [Joh. 3, 5.]

This was not only a doctrine of the third or fourth ages, as Salmasius and Suicerus represent, but the doctrine of the very

cesse? Quid ergo? alii tincti non sunt. Non tamen comites Christi, sed æmuli fidei, Legis doctores et Pharisæi. Unde et suggeritur, quum adversantes Domino tingui noluerint, eos, qui Dominum sequebantur, tinctos fuisse, nec cum æmulis suis sapuisse, maxime quando Dominus, cui adhærebant, testimonio Ioannem extulisset, *Nemo*, dicens, *major inter natos fœminarum Ioanne Baptizatore.* Alii plane satis coacte injiciunt, tunc Apostolos baptismi vicem implesse, quum in navicula fluctibus aspersi operti sunt; ipsum quoque Petrum, per mare ingredientem, satis mersum. Ut opinor autem, aliud est aspergi vel intercipi violentia maris, aliud tingui disciplina religionis. . . . . Nunc sive tincti quoquo modo fuerunt, sive illoti perseveraverunt, ut et illud dictum Domini de uno lavacro sub Petri persona ad nos tantummodo spectet, de salute tamen Apostolorum satis temerarium est æstimare, quia non illis vel primæ allectionis, et exinde individuæ familiaritatis prærogativa compendium baptismi conferre posset, cum illi, opinor, sequebantur illum, qui credenti cuique salutem pollicebatur. *Fides tua te*, aiebat, *salvum fecit*, et, *Remittuntur tibi peccata;* credenti utique, nec tamen tincto.

[82] Vid. August. Ep. 108. [al. 265.] (t. 2. p. 897 e.) Tunc ergo, quando ab Hierosolymis exiit cum discipulis suis in Judæam terram, et illic morabatur cum eis, baptizabat non per seipsum, sed per discipulos suos; quos intelligimus jam fuisse baptizatos, sive baptismo Johannis, sicut nonnulli arbitrantur, sive, quod magis credibile est, baptismo Christi. Neque enim ministerium baptizandi defugeret, ut haberet baptizatos servos, per quos cæteros baptizaret, qui non defugit memorabilis illius humilitatis ministerium, quando eis lavit pedes; et petenti Petro, ut non tantum pedes, verum etiam manus et caput ei lavaret, respondit, *Qui lotus est, non indiget, nisi ut pedes lavet: sed est mundus totus;* ubi intelligitur, quod jam Petrus baptizatus fuerat.—Anon. Auctor. De Non Iterand. Bapt. ad calc. Cypr. p. 23. Ed. Oxon. (Opuscul. p. 21.) Quoniam quidem et ipsi Apostoli et discipuli, qui etiam alios baptizabant, qui etiam a Domino baptizati non statim Spiritum Sanctum acceperint, &c.—Clemens Alexandr. Hypotypos. l. 5. ap. Ioan. Mosch. Prat. Spirit. c. 176. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1133 d. 6.) Ναὶ ἀληθῶς ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καθὼς Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεὺς, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τόμῳ Ὑποτυπώσεων μέμνηται. Φησὶ γὰρ, τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ῥητὸν ἐξηγούμενος τὸ λέγον, Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα, ὁ Χριστὸς λέγεται Πέτρον μόνον βεβαπτικέναι, Πέτρος δὲ Ἀνδρέαν, Ἀνδρέας Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τοὺς λοιπούς.

[83] B. 10. ch. 2. s. 20. v. 3. pp. 476—481.

first ages immediately succeeding the Apostles: for we see Hermes Pastor, who lived in the apostolical age, founds the general necessity of baptism upon that very saying of our Saviour. And therefore they who represent this doctrine of the necessity of baptism as a novelty or an error, first introduced into the Church in the age of St. Austin against the Pelagian heretics, do manifest wrong both to the doctrine itself, and to St. Austin, and to the Ancients, who embraced and delivered the same before him. And it gives an unnecessary advantage to the anti-pædobaptists, which a right understanding of this matter absolutely takes from them. I thought it therefore of some use to observe this against Salmasius and Suicerus, and to add it to the observations which Mr. Wall has made upon Hermes Pastor.

From Justin Martyr.

7. Another ancient writer, who lived within the compass of the second century, was Justin Martyr, who very plainly speaks of infant-baptism as used from the time of the Apostles. For in one of his Apologies[84] he takes occasion to say, there were among Christians in his time 'many persons of both sexes, some sixty, and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples to Christ from their infancy, and continued virgins, or uncorrupted, all their lives.' Now Justin wrote this Apology about the year 148, in the middle of the second century, and therefore those, whom he speaks of as baptized sixty or seventy years before in their infancy, must be persons baptized in the first age, while some of the Apostles were living. In another place of the same Apology[85] he urges these words of our Saviour, (Joh. 3, 3 and 5,) "Except ye be regenerated, or born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," to prove the necessity of baptism. And, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, he speaks[86] 'of the whole progeny of Adam as liable to death and the deception of the Serpent by reason of Adam's sin, beside the particular guilt which each man contracts by actual sin in his own person.' Now if all mankind be born with

[84] Apol. 2. (p. 62 b.) *Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἑξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι.* [Apol. 1. juxt. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1742. Ed.]

[85] Ibid. (p. 94 a.) *Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς, κ. τ. λ.*

[86] Dialog. c. Tryph. (p. 315 lin. ult.) *Τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τοῦ Ὄφεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου.*

original sin, this extends to infants, who have need of regeneration, or baptism, to free them from it. And this assertion in Justin by consequence proves the necessity of baptism for infants, as well as others, that they may have redemption from original sin. In another place of the same Dialogue[87] he makes baptism parallel to circumcision, saying, 'We have not received that carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, through the mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is incumbent on all persons to receive it in the same way.' Now if baptism be answerable to circumcision, and succeed in its room, and be necessary to be received as the means to obtain the true circumcision of the Spirit; then as infants were admitted to circumcision, so they were to be admitted to baptism, that being the ordinary means of applying the mercy of the Gospel to them, and cleansing them from the guilt of original sin.

And the author of the Recognitions, contemporary with Justin Martyr.

8. Next after Justin Martyr, I subjoin the ancient author of the book called The Recognitions, or Travels of St. Peter; because, though it be not the genuine work of Clemens Romanus, whose name it borrowed, yet it is an ancient writing of the same age with Justin Martyr, mentioned by Origen in his Philocalia, and by some ascribed to Bardesanes Syrus, who lived about the middle of the second century. This author speaks of the necessity of baptism in the very same style as Justin Martyr did, making it universally necessary to purge away original sin, and to qualify men for the kingdom of heaven. For, putting an objection by way of question[88],

[87] Ibid. See ch. 1. s. 10. p. 12. the last part n. 42.

[88] Recognit. l. 6. n. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 551.) Quid confert aquæ baptismus ad Dei cultum? Primo quidem, quia quod Deo placuit impletur; secundo, quia regenerato ex aquis, et Deo renato, fragilitas prioris nativitatis, quæ tibi per hominem facta est, amputatur; et ita demum pervenire poteris ad salutem: aliter vero impossibile est. Sic enim nobis cum sacramento verus Propheta testatus est, dicens, *Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum.*—This is repeated in the Greek Clementines, Hom. 11. n. 26. (ibid. p. 698.) Τί συμβάλλεται πρὸς εὐσέβειαν τὸ βαπτισθῆναι ὕδατι; Πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι τὸ δόξαν Θεῷ πράττεις· δεύτερον δὲ, ἐξ ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθεὶς Θεῷ, αἰτίᾳ φόβῳ, τὴν ἐξ ἐπιθυμίας πρώτην σοι γενομένην καταλλάσσεις γένεσιν, καὶ οὕτως σωτηρίας τυχεῖν δύνῃ· ἄλλως δὲ ἀδύνατον· οὕτως γὰρ ἡμῖν ὤμοσεν ὁ Προφήτης, εἰπών, Ἀμὴν ὑμῖν λέγω, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε ὕδατι ζῶντι, εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς, Υἱοῦ, Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

'What does baptism by water contribute toward the worship of God?' he answers, 'First, that it is fulfilling that which is the will and pleasure of God. Then, secondly, the man that is regenerated by water, and born again to God, is thereby freed from the weakness of his first nativity, which comes to him by man: and so he is made capable of salvation, which he could not otherwise obtain. For so the true prophet (meaning Christ) has testified with an oath, saying, *Verily I say unto you, Except one be born again of water, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*' This author indeed does not speak particularly of the baptism of infants, but his reasons are such as show his discourse to extend to them. For if baptism be necessary upon these two accounts, first, to cut off concupiscence, or original sin, which is the infirmity of our first birth; and then to qualify us to enter into the kingdom of God; these are general reasons for baptism, which make it necessary for infants as well as any other, since according to this author, they are born in original sin, and cannot enter into the kingdom of God till that sin be purged away by the waters of baptism.

Here then we have another author within the compass of the two first ages, directly confronting that assertion of Salmasius and Suicerus, that the doctrine of the necessity of baptism to salvation was not the doctrine of the two first ages, but only an opinion taken up afterwards, upon which foundation the practice of infant-baptism was introduced into the Church. For no one can, or ever did, declare himself plainer for the necessity of baptism to salvation, than this author does from the words of our Saviour Christ, which he interprets, as all the Ancients both before and after him did, of the ordinary necessity of water-baptism to salvation. So that if infant-baptism was founded, as Salmasius pleads, upon the opinion of the necessity of baptism to salvation, this author must be an asserter of infant-baptism, because he was undeniably an asserter of the general necessity of baptism to salvation. I have the rather insisted a little upon this author's meaning, because I know not whether his testimony has been produced before in this cause by any other.

9. Not long after the time of Justin Martyr and the author last mentioned, lived Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, who, as Mr. And Irenæus.

Dodwell[89] evidently shows, and Dr. Cave[90] from him, was born in the latter end of the first century, about the year 97, and was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. About the year 176, he wrote his Book against Heresies, being then near eighty years old, and died not many years after. So that he must needs be a competent witness of the Church's sense and practice upon this point during the second century. Now there are three things relating to this matter, which appear very evident from him. First, that the Church then believed the doctrine of original sin. Secondly, that the ordinary means of purging away this sin was baptism. Thirdly, that children, as well as others, were then actually baptized to obtain remission of sins, and apply the redemption of Christ to them. For the doctrine of original sin, he sometimes[91] calls it the sin of our first parents, which was done away in Christ, by his loosing the bonds wherein we were held and bound over unto death: the sin whereby we offended God[92] in the first Adam, by disobeying his command, but were reconciled to God in the second Adam by obedience unto death. So that infants, as well as others, were under the guilt of this sin, and had need of a redeemer with the rest of mankind, to deliver them from it. Now the ordinary way of being freed from this original guilt, he says, is baptism, which is our regeneration[93], or new birth unto God. And this he expressly affirms to be administered to children as well as adult persons. 'For,' says

[89] Dissert. 3. in Iren. c. 25. (pp. 269, seqq.) Convenient præterea, &c.

[90] Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 40.) Cl. Dodwellus .... dissertatione *de Ætate Irenæi*, quam una cum aliis ad novam Irenæi editionem parat, aliter plane quam vulgo fieri solet, Irenæi tempora disponit.... Statuit igitur Irenæum natum esse sub Nerva, anno Chr. 97. Quod quidem ex ipsius verbis colligi posse videtur, l. 5. c. 30., ubi exitum imperii Domitiani vocat σχεδὸν τὴν ἡμέτεραν γενεὰν, seu, ut habet antiqua versio, *pene nostrum sæculum*. Sæculum vero suum a suis natalibus ipsum deducere, nulli dubium esse potest. Circa annum ut videtur 122, dum adhuc ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ erat, l. 3. c. 3., Polycarpum vidit et audivit, &c.

[91] Iren. l. 5. c. 19. (p. 429. 5.)... Protoplasti peccatum per corruptionem Primogeniti emendationem accipiens.... Vinculis autem illis resolutis, per quæ alligati eramus morti.

[92] Ibid. l. 5. c. 16. (p. 425. 5.)... Quem [Deum] in primo quidem Adam offendimus, non facientes ejus præceptum; in secundo autem Adam reconciliati sumus, obedientes usque ad mortem facti.

[93] Ibid. l. 1. c. 18. (p. 88. 20.)... Καὶ ὅτι μὲν εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν ὑποβέβληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ἐλέγχοντες αὐτοὺς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν ἐν τῷ προσήκοντι τόπῳ.

he[94], 'Christ came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who by him are regenerated unto God,—infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through the several ages, being made an infant for infants, that he might sanctify infants; and for little ones, he was made a little one, to sanctify them of that age also.' No art can elude this passage, so long as it is owned that regeneration means baptism. And for this we have the explication of Irenæus himself, who calls baptism by the name of *regeneration;* and so all the Ancients commonly do, as Suicerus[95], against whom I am now disputing, scruples not to own, alleging Justin Martyr[96], Chrysostom[97], and Gregory Nyssen[98] to this purpose. Which fully evinces infant-baptism in the age of Irenæus, that is, in the second century, to have been the common practice of the Church.

And Tertullian.

10. In the latter end of the second century and beginning of the third lived Tertullian, presbyter of the Church of Carthage, who though he had some singular notions about this matter, yet he sufficiently testifies the Church's practice. In his own private opinion he was for deferring the baptism of infants, especially where there was no danger of death, till they came to years of discretion. But he so argues for this,

[94] Ibid. l. 2. c. 39. (p. 160. 42.) Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, &c.

[95] Thes. Eccles. voce, Ἀναγέννησις. (t. 1. p. 243.) Quia baptismus est inter causas regenerationis instrumentales, qua regenerationis gratia nobis significatur et obsignatur, usitatissime Græcis Patribus *ἀναγέννησις* vocatur. [See the three next notes. Consult also Suicer, as above, a little further on, citing another passage from Nyssen de Bapt. Christi, (t. 3. p. 369.) where he terms the child just baptized *ἀναγεννήσεως παῖδα,* and proposing to read *τὸ ἀρτίτοκον, new-born,* instead of *εὐθύτοκον, as soon as born,* which is a doubtful word and unsanctioned by any classical authority that I am aware of. Ed.]

[96] [Apol. 2. (p. 93 e.) Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ ὃν ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται.

[97] In Gal. 4. (t. 10. p. 711 c.).... Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσις μὲν οὐδεμία, τὰ δὲ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενα, ἅπερ ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοὶ, ... διαπλάττει καὶ ἀναγεννᾷ τὸν βαπτιζόμενον.

[98] Orat. de Bapt. Christi. (t. 3. p. 368.) Βάπτισμα τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἁμαρτιῶν κάθαρσιν, ἄφεσις πλημμελημάτων, ἀνακαινισμοῦ καὶ ἀναγεννήσεως αἰτία. *Grischov.*]

as to show us that the practice of the Church was otherwise: for he says[99], 'According to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more advantageous, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be deceived by a child's proving of wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed, "Do not forbid them to come unto me." Let them come therefore when they are grown up: let them come when they can learn; when they can be taught whither it is they come: let them be made Christians, when they can know Christ. What need their innocent age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men proceed more cautiously in worldly things: and he that is not trusted with earthly goods, shall he be trusted with divine? Let them know how to ask salvation, that you may appear to give it to one that asketh. For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be delayed, because they are exposed to temptations, as well virgins that are come to maturity, as those that are in widowhood by the loss of a consort, until they either marry, or be confirmed in continence.'

The way of Tertullian's arguing upon this point shows plainly that he was for introducing a new practice; that, therefore, it was the custom of the Church in his time to give baptism to infants, as well as adult persons: and his arguments tend not only to exclude infants, but all persons that are unmarried or in widowhood, for fear of temptation. Which are rules that no one beside himself ever thought of, much less were they confirmed by any Church's practice. But even this advice of Tertullian, as singular as it was, seems only calcu-

[99] De Bapt. c. 18. (p. 231 c.) Pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? Quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possint, et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus, *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant ergo, dum adolescunt; veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in sæcularibus. Ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur! Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minori de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est; tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentia corroborentur.

lated for cases where there was no danger or apprehensions of death: for otherwise he pleads[1] as much for the necessity of baptism as any other, both from those words of our Saviour, "Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," [Joh. 3, 5.] as also from the general corruption of original sin, which renders every son of Adam unclean till he be made a Christian: which is only done in baptism; for men are not born Christians, but made so. And therefore in case of necessity, he thought every Christian had power to give baptism, rather than any person should die without it. Which seems to imply that his opinion for delaying baptism, whether of infants or others, respected only such cases where there was no danger of death; but even in those cases the practice of the Church was otherwise, for she baptized infants as soon as they were born, though without any imminent danger of death, as appears from Tertullian's discourse itself, who laboured to make an innovation, but without any success; for the same practice continued in the Church in the following ages.

And Origen.

11. Origen lived in the beginning of the third century, and nothing can be plainer than the testimonies alleged from him. In one place he says, 'Every one is born in original sin;' which he thus proves[2] from the words of David, saying, "I was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bear me:" [Ps. 51, 5.] showing, 'that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity; and that therefore it was said, as we mentioned before, that none is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.

[1] De Anima, c. 40. (p. 294 c.) Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur: tam diu immunda, quam diu recenseatur. Peccatrix autem, quia immunda, recipiens ignominiam ex carnis societate, &c.—De Bapt. c. 13. (p. 229 c.) Fuerit salus retro per fidem nudam, &c.

[2] Hom. 8. in Levit. t. 1. p. 145. (t. 2. p. 230 b.) Audi David dicentem, *In iniquitatibus,* inquit, *conceptus sum, et in peccatis peperit me mater mea,* ostendens, quod quæcunque anima in carne nascatur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur: et propterea dictum esse illud, quod jam superius memoravimus, *Quia nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus.* Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cum baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem [al. pro remissione] peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari? Cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur. —See n. 79. p. 53.

Besides all this, it may be inquired, what is the reason why the baptism of the Church, which is given for remission of sins, is by the custom of the Church given to infants also? Whereas if there were nothing in infants that wanted remission and indulgence, the grace of baptism might seem needless to them.' In another place[3] he says, 'Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? or when did they commit them? or how can any reason be given for baptizing them, but only according to that sense which we mentioned a little before,—"None is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth?" And for that reason infants are baptized, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away: and, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."' Where he not only makes infant-baptism the practice of the Church, but derives it from divine institution. As he does in another place[4] from apostolical tradition: for he affirms, 'that the Church received the order of baptizing infants from the Apostles. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be washed away by water and the Spirit; by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin.'

And Cyprian with the Council of Carthage under him.

12. In the middle of this age lived St. Cyprian, in whose time there was a question moved concerning the day on which infants ought to be baptized. For one Fidus, an African bishop, had sent a query to him on this case,—Whether infants were to be baptized, if need required, as soon as they were born, or not till the eighth day, according to the rule given in

[3] In Luc. Hom. 14. t. 2. p. 223. (t. 3. p. 948 e.) Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi, juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus, *Nullus mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram.* Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum cœlorum.—See Job. 14, 4 and 5. according to the Septuagint, as at n. 79. p. 53.

[4] In Rom. l. 5. c. 6. p. 543. (t. 4. p. 565 a.) .... Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia [al. quod] essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent; propter quas etiam corpus ipsum *corpus peccati* nominatur.

the case of circumcision? To this question St. Cyprian and a Council of sixty-six bishops returned this synodical answer[5]: 'As to the case of infants, whereas you judge, that they ought not to be baptized within two or three days after they are born; and that the rule of circumcision should be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born;—we were all in our council of the contrary opinion. It was our unanimous resolution and judgment, that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none as soon as he is born. For if the greatest offenders, and they that have sinned most grievously against God before, have afterward, when they come to believe, forgiveness of their sins; and no person is kept off from baptism and grace; how much less reason is there to prohibit an infant, who being newly born has no other sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes for that reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but other men's sins, that are forgiven him?' Here we have both the practice of the Church, and the reason of it together: infants were baptized, because they were born in original sin, and needed baptism to cleanse them from the guilt and pollution of it.

To this we may add another place of Cyprian, where, describing the great wickedness of those that lapsed in time of persecution, he thus aggravates their crime[6]: 'That nothing

[5] Ep. 59. [al. 64.] ad Fidum, p. 158. (p. 279.) Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sunt, constitutos, baptizari non opportere, et considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares; longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est.... Universi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam, &c.—Ib. (p. 281.) Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur; et [a] baptismo atque a gratia nemo prohibetur; quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? Qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendum hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.

[6] De Lapsis, p. 125. (p. 90.) Ac nequid deesset ad criminis cumulum, infantes quoque, parentum manibus vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt parvuli, quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti.... Nos nihil fecimus, nec, derelicto cibo et poculo Domini, ad profana contagia sponte properavimus: perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes

might be wanting to fill up the measure of their wickedness, their little infants were either led or carried in their parents' arms, and lost that which they had obtained at their first coming into the world,'—meaning the benefits of their baptism; and therefore he brings them in thus pleading against their parents in an elegant strain at the day of Judgment: 'This was no fault of ours, we did not of our own accord forsake the meat and cup of the Lord, to run and partake of those profane pollutions; it was the unfaithfulness of others that ruined us; we had our parents for our murderers; they denied us God for our father, and the Church for our mother: for whilst we were little, and unable to take care of ourselves, and ignorant of so great a wickedness, we were ensnared by the treachery of others, and by them drawn into a partnership of their impieties.' Here we may observe, that children were made partakers of the eucharist, which Cyprian calls 'the meat and drink of the Lord.' And this is evident from other passages in the same author: which is a further evidence for the practice of infant-baptism; for it is certain that none but baptized persons were ordinarily allowed to partake of the eucharist at the Lord's table.

I think it needless to clog this discourse with any more authorities from the Council of Eliberis, Optatus, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus, the Councils of Carthage, St. Austin, or St. Jerom, or other writers of the fourth age, which the reader may find collected together by Mr. Wall, with suitable observations on them. It is sufficient to my design, against Salmasius and Suicerus, to have proved that infant-baptism was not, owing to any new doctrine, begun in the third century, but was derived from more ancient principles, and handed down through the two first ages from apostolical practice.

Infant-baptism not to be delayed to the eighth day after the example of circumcision.

13. I shall now proceed to remark a few other things relating to the baptism of infants, among those who allowed them to be capable of it from their birth. Some there were in the African Church, as we have heard out of the last-mentioned citations from Cyprian, who were strictly for confining baptism to the eighth day, because such was the rule in the case of cir-

sensimus parricidas. Illi nobis ecclesiam matrem, illi patrem Deum negaverunt; ut, dum parvi et improvidi, et tanti facinoris ignari, per alios ad consortium criminum jungimur, aliena fraude caperemur.

cumcision: but Cyprian and the Council of Carthage answer all the arguments that were brought in favour of this novelty, which seems only to have been a question in theory, and scarce ever reduced to practice. The abettors of it pleaded, that an infant in the first days after its birth is unclean, so that any one of us abhors to kiss it. To which Cyprian answers[7], 'We judge not this to be any reason to hinder the giving to it the heavenly grace: for it is written, *To the clean all things are clean:* nor ought any of us to abhor that which God has vouchsafed to make.' To the other pretence, that the eighth day was observed in the Jewish circumcision, he answers[8], 'That this was only a type going before a shadow and resemblance, but upon Christ's coming it was fulfilled in the substance; for because the eighth day, that is, the next to the Sabbath-day, was to be the day on which the Lord was to rise from the dead, and quicken us, and give us the spiritual circumcision; this eighth day, that is, the next day to the Sabbath, or Lord's day, was signified in the type before, which type ceased when the substance came, and the spiritual circumcision was given to us. So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace, by the law that is now appointed: and that the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the circumcision that was according to the flesh;

[7] Ep. 59. [al. 64.] ad Fidum, p. 160. (p. 281.) . . . . Nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento esse oportere; scriptum est enim, *Omnia munda sunt mundis.* Nec aliquis nostrum id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus est facere. Nam etsi adhuc infans a partu novus est, non ita est tamen, ut quisquam illum, in gratia danda atque in pace facienda, horrere debeat osculari; quando in osculo infantis unusquisque nostrum pro sua religione ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat cogitare, quas in homine modo formato et recens nato quodammodo exosculamur, quando id, quod Deus fecit, amplectimur.

[8] Ibid. (p. 281.) Quod in Judaica circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque in imagine ante præmissum, sed veniente Christo veritate completum. Nam quia octavus dies, id est, post sabbatum primus dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, et nos vivificaret, et circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret: hic dies octavus, id est, post sabbatum primus et dominicus præcessit in imagine, quæ imago cessavit, superveniente postmodum veritate, et data nobis spiritali circumcisione. Propter quod neminem putamus a gratia consequenda impediendum esse ea lege, quæ jam statuta est, nec spiritalem circumcisionem impediri carnali circumcisione debere, sed omnem omnino admittendum esse ad gratiam Christi; quando et Petrus in Actis Apostolorum loquatur et dicat, *Dominus mihi dixit, neminem hominum communem dicendum et immundum.*

but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ; forasmuch as Peter says, in the Acts of the Apostles, "*The Lord hath showed me, that no person is to be called common or unclean.*"' This is the only place wherever we read that this question was made, and after the resolution here given, we never find that it was proposed again: so that this circumstance of time seems never to have prevailed in the practice of the Church.

Nor till three years, as Gregory Nazianzen would have had it.

Gregory Nazianzen had also a singular opinion in relation to the time of baptizing children when there was no danger of death: for in that case he thought it better to defer it till they were about three years old, but in case of danger to give it immediately after they were born, for fear they should die unbaptized. His words are these[9]: 'What say you to those that are as yet infants, and are not in a capacity to be sensible either of the grace, or of the loss of it? Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all means, if any danger so require it: for it is better that they should be sanctified without their own sense of it, than that they should die unsealed and uninitiated. And the ground of this is circumcision, which was given on the eighth day, and was a typical seal, and was given to those who had not the use of reason: as also the anointing of the doorposts, which preserved the first-born by things that have no sense. As for others, I give my opinion that they should stay three years or thereabouts, till they can hear the mystical words, and make answers to them; and though they do not perfectly understand them, yet they can then frame to speak them: and then you may sanctify them in soul and body with the great sacrament of initiation.' But this was a singular opinion of Nazianzen, taken up upon some particular reasons, which the Church never assented to: and therefore I join this

[9] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 658 a.) *Τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάνυγε· εἴπέρ τις ἐπείγοι κίνδυνος· κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα. Καὶ τούτου λόγος ἡμῖν, ἡ ὀκταήμερος περιτομὴ, τυπική τις οὖσα σφραγὶς καὶ ἀλογίστοις ἔτι προσαγομένη· ὡς δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν φλιῶν χρίσις, διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττουσα τὰ πρωτότοκα. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμείναντας, ἢ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τούτου, ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαί τι μυστικὸν, καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δυνατόν· εἰ καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελέως, ἀλλ' οὖν τυπούμενα, οὕτως ἁγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως.*

with that other of Fidus, the African, as peculiar fancies of private men, which never gained any esteem or credit in the public or avowed practice of the Church.

Yet in some Churches it was deferred to the time of an approaching festival.

14. Yet in some Churches a custom had prevailed to defer the baptism of infants, as well as adult persons, where there was no apparent danger of death, to the time of some of the more eminent and noted festivals, which were more peculiarly designed and set apart for the solemn administration of baptism. Socrates says[10], in Thessaly they only baptized at Easter: upon which account a great many in those parts died without baptism. He does not say expressly that this was the case of children: but there are some reasons to incline one to believe that it related to them as well as others; for both in the French and Spanish Councils there are canons which order the baptism of children to be administered only at Easter, except in case of necessity and imminent danger of death. In the Council of Auxerre[11] it was decreed for the French Churches, 'that no children should be baptized at any other time, save on the solemn festival of Easter, except such as were near death,' whom they called *grabatarii*, because they were baptized *on a sick-bed:* and 'if any one contumaciously in contempt of this decree offered their children to baptism in any of their churches, they should not be received:' and 'if any presbyter presumed to receive them against this order, he should be suspended three months from the communion of the Church.' The second Council of Bracara[12] also speaks of the like practice in the Spanish Churches, ordering 'that in the middle of

[10] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 297. 7.) *Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ Πάσχα μόνον βαπτίζουσι. Διὸ σφόδρα πλὴν ὀλίγων οἱ λοιποὶ μὴ βαπτισθέντες ἀποθνήσκουσι.*

[11] C. 18. (t. 5. p. 959 b.) Non licet absque Paschæ solennitate ullo tempore baptizare, nisi illos quibus mors vicina est, quos *grabatarios* dicunt. Quod si quis in alio pago, contumacia faciente, post interdictum hoc infantes suos ad baptismum detulerit in ecclesias nostras, non recipiantur. Et quicunque presbyter ipsos extra nostrum præceptum recipere præsumpserit, tribus mensibus a communione ecclesiæ sequestratus sit.—[*Grabatarii*, from *grabatum*, which Du Fresne (Glossar. Latinit. Paris. 1733. t. 3. col. 923.) explains by *reclinati capitis susceptio &c.*, and adds, Notus est Latinis *grabatus*, ut et Græcis *κράβατος* vel *κράββατος*, pro specie lectuli humilioris et portatilis, &c. Ed.]

[12] [Al. Bracar. 3.] c. 9. (ibid. p. 898 d.) Præcipiant, mediante Quadragesima, ex viginti diebus baptizandos infantes ad exorcismi purgationem offerre. [Vid. C. Matiscon. 2. c. 3.—(ibid. p. 981 a.) . . . Omnes . . . a die quadragesima cum infantibus suis ad ecclesiam observare præcipimus, &c. Ed.]

Lent, such infants as were to be baptized at Easter should be presented twenty days before to undergo the purgation, or preparation of exorcism.' St. Austin also speaks of children[13], infants, little ones, sucklings hanging on their mothers' breasts, coming at Easter to be baptized among adult persons: whence Palm-Sunday, or the Sunday before Easter, had the name of *Octavæ infantium, the Octave of infants,* upon their account. St. Ambrose also speaks of great numbers of infants coming at Easter to be baptized: 'This,' says he[14], 'is the Paschal gift: pious fathers and holy mothers bring their new-born progeny in great multitudes by faith to the holy font, from whose womb being regenerated under the tree of faith, they shine with the innocent ornament of lights and tapers.' These are abundant proofs, that though in cases of extremity children might receive baptism at any time, yet in other cases, where there was no visible appearance or danger of death, their baptism in many places was deferred till the Easter festival, as well as that of adult persons.

A resolution of some questions. Whether children might be baptized, when only one parent was Christian?

15. Whilst I am upon the subject of infant-baptism, it will not be improper to resolve certain cases and questions, that may be put concerning it, so far as they are capable of being resolved from the practice of the Church, or judgment of the ancient writers. One is concerning such children as had only one parent Christian, and the other a Jew or a Heathen. These were reckoned capable of baptism upon the right of one parent being Christian; for so it was resolved in the fourth Council of Toledo[15], in the case of such women as had Jews for their husbands, 'that the children that were born of them

[13] Serm. 160. de Temp. t. 10. p. 331. [al. Serm. 376. c. 2.] (t. 5. part. 2. p. 1469 a.) Hodie Octavæ dicuntur Infantium.. Illi pueri, infantes, parvuli, lactentes, maternis uberibus inhærentes, et quantum in eos gratiæ referatur nescientes, ut ipsi videtis, quia infames vocantur, et ipsi habent Octavas hodie. Et isti senes, juvenes, adolescentuli, omnes infantes, &c.

[14] De Mysterio Paschæ, c. 5. [al. Serm. 35. de Myster. Paschæ, 2. c. 5.] (t. 2. append. p. 438 a.)..... Hoc Paschæ donum .... Hinc casti patres, pudicæ etiam matres, novellam per fidem stirpem prosequuntur innumeram. Hinc sub fidei arbore ab utero fontis innocui cereorum splendet ornatus, &c.

[15] C. 62. [al. 63.] (t. 5. p. 1720 d.) Filii autem, qui ex talibus [Judæis] nati existunt, fidem atque conditionem matris sequantur. Similiter et hi, qui procreati sunt de infidelibus mulieribus et fidelibus viris, Christianam religionem sequantur, non Judaicam superstitionem. — [So Crabbe; Labbe reads *infidelibus viris,* which seems to spoil the sense. Ed.]

should follow the faith and condition of the mother: and so, on the other hand, they who had unbelieving mothers and believing fathers should follow the Christian religion, and not the Jewish superstition.'

Whether the children of excommunicated parents might be baptized.

16. Another case was concerning the children whose parents were under excommunication and the Church's censures. St. Austin had occasion to consider this case upon the account of one Auxilius, a young bishop, who, in a fit of ungoverned zeal, had rashly excommunicated one Classicianus, and, together with him, laid his whole family under an anathema and interdict: which was a practice that, however some later Popes have dealt much in it, the Ancients were not acquainted with. He also seems to have forbidden any children to be baptized, who were born in the family during this interdict. Upon which St. Austin took occasion to write to him[16], and expostulate with him upon the reasons of these proceedings, desiring to be informed, 'Upon what grounds and authority of reason, or testimony of Scripture, he could confirm his opinion? By what right a son was to be anathematized for the father's crime, or a wife for her husband's, or a servant for his master's? Or a child not yet born, if he happened to be born in the house whilst it lay under such an interdict, why it should not have the benefit of the laver of regeneration in danger of death?' In corporal punishments, he owns, sometimes it was otherwise: for 'God thought fit to punish some despisers, with their whole families,

[16] Ep. 75. [al. 250.] ad Auxil. (t. 2. p. 878 c.).... Apud caritatem tuam tacere non potui, ut si habes de hac re sententiam, certis rationibus vel scripturarum testimoniis exploratam, nos quoque docere digneris; quomodo recte anathemetur pro patris peccato filius, aut pro mariti uxor, aut pro domini servus, aut quisquam in domo etiam nondum natus, si eodem tempore, quo universa domus est anathemate obligata, nascatur, nec ei possit per lavacrum regenerationis in mortis periculo subveniri. Neque enim hæc corporalis est pœna, qua legimus quosdam contemptores Dei cum suis omnibus, qui ejusdem impietatis participes non fuerunt, pariter interfectos: tunc quidem ad terrorem viventium mortalia corpora perimebantur, quandoque utique moritura. Spiritalis autem pœna, qua fit, quod scriptum est, *Quæ ligaveris in terra, erunt ligata et in cœlo*, animas obligat, de quibus dictum est, *Anima patris mea est, et anima filii mea est. Anima, quæ peccaverit, ipsa morietur.* Audisti fortasse, aliquos magni nominis sacerdotes cum domo sua quempiam anathemasse peccantium: sed forte si essent interrogati, reperirentur idonei reddere inde rationem. Ego autem, quoniam, si quis ex me quærat, utrum recte fiat? quid ei respondeam, non invenio, nunquam hoc facere ausus sum, cum de quorumdam facinoribus, immaniter adversus ecclesiam perpetratis, gravissime permoverer.

though they were not accessory to the contemner's crimes, that by the death of mortal bodies, which must otherwise have shortly died, he might strike terror into the living: but he never dealt thus in spiritual punishments, which affect the soul; but "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."' [Ezek. 18, 4.] And therefore St. Austin, for his own part, declares 'he never durst use excommunication to this purpose, though he was never so highly provoked by the most villainous actions of any men against the Church; because if any one should ask him a reason of such his practice, and oblige him to show the justice of his proceeding, he freely owns he could find nothing to answer him.' Whence I think we may fairly conclude, that the excommunication of a parent did not deprive the child of his right to baptism: and though there were some who made a stretch upon Church power in this case, yet their actions were so far from being generally approved, or authorized by any rule, that they were rather thought to deserve a censure.

The reader that would know how the Reformed Churches have resolved this same case, about the admission of the children of excommunicated persons to baptism, may consult another Discourse[17], which I have formerly had occasion to write in defence of the Church, where this case is more particularly considered and resolved upon the principles and practice of some of the most eminent Churches of the Reformation.

Whether exposed children, whose parents were unknown, might be baptized.

17. Another question sometimes agitated in the primitive Church, as concerning such children as were either exposed, or redeemed from the barbarians, whose parents were unknown, and consequently it was utterly uncertain whether they were ever baptized or not. This was a case that often happened in Afric, where the Christians bordered upon several barbarous nations; and it was thus resolved, upon a consultation in one of the Councils of Carthage[18], 'that all such infants as had no

[17] French Church's Apology for the Church of England, b. 3. c. 19; originally published in 1706, and now again reproduced in the tenth volume of this edition.

[18] Carth. 5. c. 6. (t. 2. p. 1216 c.) Placuit, de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos, ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consuluerunt, quia multos tales a Barbaris redimunt.—Vid. Cod. Afric. c. 72. (ibid. 1094 c.) The same in Greek.

certain witnesses to testify that they were baptized, neither could they testify for themselves, by reason of their age, that the sacrament had been given them; that such should without any scruple be baptized, lest an hesitation in that case should deprive them of the purgation of the sacrament.' And this resolution was made at the instance of the legates of the Churches of Mauritania, who informed the Council that many such children were redeemed by them from the barbarians. In which case it was uncertain whether their parents were Heathens or Christians.

Whether the children of Jews or Heathens might be baptized in any case whatsoever

18. But, as in some cases, if it plainly appeared that the parents of infants, who by some providential means fell into the hands of Christians, were mere Jews or Pagans; yet in such cases baptism was not denied to the infants, because they were now become the possession of Christians, who undertook to be their sponsors, and answer for their education. This is evident from St. Austin[20], who says it in express terms: 'This grace is sometimes vouchsafed to the children of infidels, that they are baptized, when by some means through the secret Providence of God they happen to come into the hands of pious Christians.' Sometimes[21] they were bought or redeemed with money, sometimes made lawful captives in war, and sometimes taken up by any charitable person, when they were exposed by their parents. In all which cases, either the faith and promises of the sponsors, or the faith of the Church in general, who was their common mother, and whose children they were now supposed to be, was sufficient to give them a title to Christian baptism. The holy virgins of the Church did many times in such exigencies become their sureties, and take care of their religious education. And so it happened, as is observed by St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of the excellent book, *De*

[20] De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, c. 22. t. 7. p. 527. (t. 10. p. 742 g.) Et aliquando filiis infidelium præstatur hæc gratia [nempe, ut baptizentur] cum occulta Dei providentia in manus piorum quomodocunque perveniunt.

[21] Vid. August. Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 266 d.) Cum videas multos non offerri a parentibus, sed etiam a quibuslibet extraneis, sicut a dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam, mortuis parentibus suis, parvuli baptizantur ab eis oblati, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt, nutriendos a quibuslibet, nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum.

Vocatione Gentium[22], that many who were deserted by the impiety of their kindred, were taken care of by the good offices of others, and brought to be baptized by strangers, when they were neglected by their nearest relations. Which was so general and charitable a practice among the Ancients, that some learned modern writers[23] speak of it with great commendation upon that account, and tell us such children have a right to baptism, after the same manner that Abraham's servants, bought with his money, had to circumcision, as well as those that were born in his house. And they concur so far in asserting it to be the common practice beyond all controversy in the primitive Church, as to say, that St. Austin made use of it as an uncontested argument to prove free grace and election against the Pelagians. Which I note only here by the way, for the sake of some mistaken persons, who impute the encouragement of the same practice in the English Church, not to her charity, but rather to a fault and error in her constitution.

Whether children, born while their parents were Heathens, might be baptized.

19. There is one question more concerning such infants as were born while their parents were Heathens: but of these there was no doubt ever made; for as soon as the parents were baptized themselves, they were obliged to take care that their wives and children and whole families should be baptized likewise. To which purpose there is a law in the Justinian Code[24]

[22] L. 2. c. 8. [*Quare tanta multitudo non regeneratorum infantium a perpetua alienetur salute.*] juxt. Ed. Basil. 1538. (t. 2. p. 38 d.) . . . Multis sæpe, quos suorum impietas deseruit, alienorum cura servierit, et ad regenerationem venerint per extraneos, quæ eis non erat providenda per proximos.—[This tract, *De Vocatione Gentium*, is rejected from the Works of Ambrose by the Benedictine Editor, Paris. 1686—90, as spurious. It is found *inter Opera Leonis Magni, Venet.* 1756. *t.* 2., where the passage, as cited above, forms the last clauses of b. 2. ch. 23. (p. 236.) according to that altered edition of the Treatise. Ed.]

[23] Vid. Rivetum et Walæum in Synopsi Purioris Theologiæ, disput. 44. n. 49. (p. 615.) Excludimus autem a baptismo infantes eorum, qui a fœdere plane sunt alieni; quales sunt liberi Gentilium, &c. . . . . Nisi forte per adoptionem legitimam aut servitutem justam, et proprie dictam, fidelium familiis tanquam proprii sunt adscripti, atque insiti. Hoc enim casu multæ Reformatæ Ecclesiæ eos baptizant, quia a Deo in fœderis sui communionem hoc pacto eos adscribi judicant, idque Genes. 17, 12 et 13., quod in Veteri Ecclesia ita extra controversiam fuit ut Augustinus ex hoc facto argumentum efficax electionis gratuitæ adversus Pelagianos nunnunquam duxerit.

[24] L. 1. tit. 11. de Paganis, leg. 10. (t. 4. p. 204.) Qui nondum sunt baptizati, ipsi cum liberis et conjugibus et omnibus suis perducant se ad sanctas

inflicting a severe penalty upon them in case of neglect or prevarication in this matter. For it is there enacted, 'that such Pagans as were yet unbaptized should present themselves, with their wives and children, and all that appertained to them, in the church, and there they should cause their little ones immediately to be baptized, and the rest as soon as they were taught the Scriptures according to the canons. But if any persons for the sake of a public office or dignity, or to get an estate, received a fallacious baptism themselves, but in the mean time left their wives, or children, or servants, or any that were retainers or near relations to them, in their ancient error, their goods in that case are ordered to be confiscated, and their persons punished by a competent judge, and excluded from bearing any office in the commonwealth.' Photius repeats this law in his Nomocanon[25], and adds to it another of the same nature, concerning the Samaritans, 'that though they themselves were not to be baptized till they had been two years catechumens, yet their little ones, who were not capable of instruction, might be admitted to baptism without any such delay or prorogation.' This law is now extant among Justinian's Novels[26]. From all which it appears, that as soon as any Jews or Heathens were either baptized themselves, or had only taken upon them the state of catechumens, their children were made capable of baptism, and accordingly by law required to be baptized.

Thus much of infants, and the several cases I have met with in the writings of the Ancients, relating to their baptism.

ecclesias: et suos parvulos liberos sine more baptizari current: majores vero prius Scripturas secundum canones doceantur. Si vero propter militiam, vel dignitatem, vel facultates habendas fingant baptizari; et liberos aut conjuges eorum, aut domesticos suos in errore reliquerint, et eos qui sibi attinent et necessitudine juncti sunt; publicantur et competenter plectuntur, et rempublicam non attingunt.—This law is repeated by Balsamon, Constit. Eccles. ap. Justell. Biblioth. Jur. Canon. (t. 2. p. 1298.) and also in Photius, Nomocan. tit. 4. c. 4. (ap. Justell. ibid. pp. 906, 907.) Περὶ τοῦ χρῆναι, κ.τ.λ.

[25] Tit. 4. c. 7. (ap. Justell. t. 2. p. 908.) . . . . . Ὅτι ἐὰν Ἰουδαῖος διὰ τὸ φευγεῖν ἔγκλημα, κ.τ.λ.

[26] Novel. 144. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 619.) . . . . Per duos primum annos in fide instituantur, et pro viribus Scripturas ediscant: tuncque demum sacro redemptionis offerantur baptismati, tam longi temporis pœnitentia prorsus redemptionis fructum assecuti. Pueros autem admodum, qui per ætatem doctrinas intelligere nequeunt, etiam absque hac observatione sacro dignari baptismate admittimus.

CHAP. V.

Of the baptism of adult persons.

No adult persons to be baptized without previous instruction to qualify them to answer for themselves.

1. The other sort of persons on whom baptism was conferred were adult persons, who were grown up to years of understanding, and who in those days made up the main body of the baptized. These were usually converts from Judaism or Gentilism, who, before they could be admitted to baptism, were obliged to spend some time in the state of catechumens, to qualify them to make their professions of faith and a Christian life in their own persons. For without such personal professions, there was ordinarily no admission of them to the privilege of baptism. The time of their instruction, and the substance and manner of it, has already been considered, particularly in the last Book. All therefore I have further to observe concerning them here is in relation to some special cases, which we find determined in the canons of the ancient Councils, when, because great multitudes were baptized at riper years, the Church had occasion to consider many cases, which are scarce to be met with in the rules of later ages.

Yet dumb persons allowed to be baptized in some certain cases.

2. One of these doubtful cases was in reference to dumb persons, who were incapacitated at the time of baptism from answering for themselves. In this case, if persons had desired to be baptized before this infirmity came upon them, or if they could by sufficient signs signify their present desire, the Church favourably accepted their request, and admitted them to the privilege of baptism. The first Council of Orange[27] has a canon in favour of such persons, both with respect to baptism and penance; for it decrees, 'that a person, who is suddenly struck speechless, may either be baptized, or admitted to penance, if it appears by the testimony of others that he had any such will or desire before he became dumb; or if in the time of this misfortune he could make signs to express his present desire and intention.' In the African Code there is a canon[28]

[27] C. 12. (t. 3. p. 1449 e.) Subito obmutescens, prout statutum est, baptizari aut pœnitentiam accipere potest, si voluntatis præteritæ testimonium aliorum verbis habet, aut præsentis in suo nutu.

[28] C. Carth. 3. c. 34. (t. 2. p. 1172 a.) Ut ægrotantes, si pro se respondere non possunt, cum voluntatis eorum testimonium sui dixerint, baptizentur. Similiter et de pœnitentibus agendum est.—This

to the same purpose, 'that men, so sick that they cannot answer for themselves, may be baptized, if their friends who attended them in danger do testify their desire of baptism.' And among the Canonical Answers of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, there is one[29] of the like nature: for the question is put, 'Whether if a catechumen be so disordered in his mind, that he cannot make profession of his faith, he may be baptized notwithstanding this infirmity?' and the answer is, 'He may if he be not possessed.' We have an instance of this case actually verified in the baptism of an African negro slave at Carthage, whom his master had caused to be instructed among the catechumens, and prepared him among the *competentes* for baptism. He had made his profession of faith and the usual renunciations publicly in the church, as was customary for the candidates of baptism to do before they came to the baptistery to consummate the mystery: but just before the time of baptism he fell sick of a fever, which made him speechless. However he was baptized, others answering in his name, as if it had been for an infant. Ferrandus, who tells the story, had some doubts concerning this baptism, which he communicated to Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa, who gave him a consolatory answer[30] to this effect: 'That this man had all the conditions required by our Saviour for adult persons, which were, *that they should believe and be baptized.* Faith and the profession of it is the act of the man; the baptizing him is only the act of the minister. And though this man had not his senses when the minister performed his act, yet he had when he himself performed his own. We believe, indeed, that none but infants are saved by the faith of those that bring them, and that at

canon is repeated in the Codex Canon. Eccles. Afric. c. 45. (ibid. p. 1071 a.), and in the later editions of the Councils it is read with a little variation, thus, according to the Greek,—Cum voluntatis eorum testimonium hi, qui suis periculo proprio [affuere], dixerint, baptizentur, &c.

[29] C. 4. (ap. Bevereg. Pand. t. 2. part. 1. p. 166 b.) Ἐρώτησις· Ἐάν τις κατηχούμενος, ὢν ἀσθενὴς, γένηται ἐκ φρενὸς, καὶ μὴ δύνηται αὐτὸς ὁμολογῆσαι τὴν πίστιν, καὶ παρακαλῶσιν οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτοῦ, ἵνα λάβῃ τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, ἕως ζῇ, ὀφείλει λαβεῖν, ἢ οὔ; Ἀπόκρισις· Ὀφείλει λαβεῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου πειράζηται.

[30] De Bapt. Æthiopis, c. 8. See before, b. 10. ch. 2. s. 24. p. 490. n. 82, part the second.—See a like case in St. Austin's Confessions, l. 4. c. 4. (t. 1. p. 99 f.).. Cum enim laboraret ille [amicus meus] febribus, jacuit diu sine sensu in sudore letali. Et quum desperaretur, baptizatus est nescius ..... baptismum acceperat mente atque sensu absentissimus.

the age of reason a man's own confession is required: but this man made his profession whilst he had his senses, and was baptized whilst he was yet alive.' From whence he concludes, 'that there was no reason to doubt of his salvation, because he had done all that was necessary on his part, and was baptized in the manner that in this case the canons had appointed.'

Let me add to all this, how is it that Albaspinæus, and many others understand that canon of the Council of Eliberis[31] which speaks of catechumens deserting their station, and forsaking the Church for a long time, yet at last desiring to be baptized. In this case, though they were speechless, they might be baptized, if either any of the clergy, or other faithful witnesses could testify that they desired to be made Christians, because their crimes were committed whilst they were in the old man: or, as other copies read it, 'because they seemed to have relinquished and bid adieu to the old man;' that is, in their former state of sin and natural corruption. And this was but the very same privilege as was allowed men in the business of penance, mentioned in the forecited Council of Orange, and also the fourth Council of Carthage[32], where it is said, 'that if a lapser desires to be admitted to penance in time of sickness, and unfortunately becomes speechless, or falls into a phrensy, while the priest who is sent for is coming to him, they who heard his desire shall testify for him, and he shall be admitted to pe-

[31] C. 45. (t. 1. p. 975 d.) Qui aliquando fuerit catechumenus, et per infinita tempora nunquam ad ecclesiam accesserit, si eum de clero quisquam agnoverit [al. cognoverit] voluisse esse Christianum, aut testes aliqui fideles exstiterint, placuit ei baptismum non negari, eo quod in veterem hominem deliquisse videatur. [al. eo quod veterem hominem dereliquisse videatur.]—[Albaspin. in loc. (ibid. p. 1002 a.) Existimarim agi de catechumeno apostata, qui, mortis insperatæ discrimine interceptus, baptismum peteret, et cui ante vox intercluderetur, quam ad eum accessisset presbyter. *Grischov.*]

[32] C. 76. (t. 2. p. 1205 e.) Qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in phrenesin versus fuerit, dent testimonium qui eum audierunt, et accipiat pœnitentiam: et si continuo creditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem, et infundatur ori ejus eucharistia. Si supervixerit, admoneatur a supradictis testibus petitioni suæ satisfactum, et subdatur statutis pœnitentiæ legibus quamdiu sacerdos qui pœnitentiam dedit, probaverit. —Vid. Leon. Ep. 89. [al. 91.] ad Theodor. Forojul. (t. 3. p. 1404 a.) Quod si aliqua vi ægritudinis, ita fuerint aggravati, ut, quod paulo ante poscebant, sub præsentia sacerdotis significare non valeant, testimonia eis fidelium prodesse debebunt, ut simul et pœnitentiæ et reconciliationis beneficium consequantur.

nance: and if he seems to be at the point of death, he shall be reconciled by the imposition of hands, and have the eucharist poured into his mouth. But if he recovers, the witnesses shall acquaint him that his petition was granted, and then he shall submit himself to the ordinary rules of penance, so long as the priest who admitted him to penance shall think fit in his discretion.' Now it is probable that after the same manner, persons who were baptized in such a condition, when they recovered, were obliged to make their professions, as was usual in baptism, when afterwards they received the imposition of hands in confirmation. But as I cannot affirm this upon the certain evidence of any rule or canon, as in the other case of penance, but only judge by parity of reason, I will not be positive, but leave every one to enjoy his own opinion.

And energumens in cases of extremity.

3. Another question was sometimes raised about the energumens, or persons possessed by evil spirits,—whether during the time of their possession it was proper to give them baptism? The Council of Eliberis[33] orders them to be deferred till they were set free and cured; but yet, in case of extremity and visible appearance of death, appoints them to be baptized. The first Council of Orange seems to have allowed it not only in absolute necessity, but in the remissions and intervals of their distemper; for it orders[34], 'that such catechumens as were possessed should be baptized, according as their necessity required, or opportunity permitted.' In the Canons of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, the same question is put, but resolved a little differently[35]: 'If baptism be desired for a catechumen that is possessed, what shall be done?' To which the answer is, 'Let him be baptized at the hour of death, and not otherwise.' So likewise in the Constitutions[36], under the name of the Apostles:

[33] C. 37. (t. 1. p. 974 e.) Eos, qui ab immundis spiritibus vexantur, si in fine mortis fuerint constituti, baptizari placet.

[34] C. 15. (t. 3. p. 1450 b.) Energumenis catechumenis, in quantum vel necessitas exegerit, vel opportunitas permiserit, de baptismate consulendum.

[35] Respons. Canon. c. 2. (ap. Bevereg. Pand. t. 2. part. 1. p. 165 d.) *Ἐρώτησις. Ἐὰν δαιμονιζόμενος κατηχούμενος ᾖ, καὶ θελήσῃ αὐτὸς ἢ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτοῦ, ἵνα λάβῃ τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, ὀφείλει λαβεῖν ἢ οὔ, καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν περὶ τὸν θάνατόν ἐστιν; Ἀπόκρισις. Ἐὰν ὁ δαιμονιζόμενος μὴ καθαρισθῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἔξοδον βαπτίζεται.*

[36] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 412.) *Ἐὰν δέ τις δαίμονα ἔχει, διδασκέσθω μὲν τὴν εὐσέβειαν, μὴ προσδεχέσθω δὲ εἰς κοινωνίαν, πρὶν ἂν καθαρισθῇ. εἰ δὲ θάνατος κατεπείγοι, προσδεχέσθω.*

'If any one is possessed with a devil, let him be taught the principles of piety, but not be received to communion till he is cleansed: yet if he be under the pressure of imminent death, let him be received.' Some understand this of being received to the communion of the eucharist, but it is plain the author means it of being received to the communion of the Church by baptism: for he is there giving rules concerning persons to be baptized, and describing their necessary qualifications; among which this is one, 'that energumens shall be cleansed before they be admitted to communion, except at the hour of death, where necessity gave them a dispensation.' And this was the ancient rule in the time of Cyprian, who says[37], 'that they who were possessed with unclean spirits were baptized in time of sickness.' And many times this benefit followed from it, that though some of those for want of faith were still vexed with unclean spirits, the true energy of baptism[38], which was to deliver men from the power of the Devil, failing in some by their own default and weakness of faith, yet in others it was found true by experience, that they, who were baptized in time of sickness and urgent necessity, were thereby delivered from the unclean spirit with which they were before possessed, and thenceforward lived a very laudable and reputable life in the Church, and made a daily proficiency and increase in heavenly grace by the augmentation of their faith. And on the contrary it oftentimes happened that some of those, who were

[37] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magnum, p. 187. (p. 298.) Si aliquis in illo movetur, quod quidam de iis, qui ægri baptizantur, spiritibus adhuc immundis tentantur; sciat Diaboli nequitiam pertinacem usque ad aquam salutarem valere, in baptismo vero omne nequitiæ suæ virus amittere.

[38] Ibid. p. 188. (p. 299.) Hoc denique et rebus ipsis experimur, ut necessitate urgente in ægritudine baptizati et gratiam consecuti, careant immundo spiritu, quo antea movebantur; et laudabiles ac probabiles in ecclesia vivant, plusque per dies singulos in augmentum cœlestis gratiæ per fidei incrementa proficiant. Et contra sæpe nonnulli de illis, qui sani baptizantur, si postmodum peccare cœperint, spiritu immundo redeunte quatiuntur; ut manifestum sit, Diabolum in baptismo fide credentis excludi; si fides postmodum defecerit, regredi.—See also Clement. Recognit., l. 4. c. 32., to the same purpose. (Cotel. ibid. p. 541.) Agatis gratias largitori omnium Patri, per eum, quem posuit regem pacis, et thesaurum ineffabilium bonorum: ut in præsenti quidem tempore diluantur peccata vestra per aquam fontis, aut fluminis, aut etiam maris, invocato super vos trino Beatudinis nomine: ut per hoc non solum fugentur, si intra vos habitant, spiritus maligni; verum etiam, quum destiteritis a peccatis, et tota fide totaque mentis puritate Deo credideritis, etiam ex aliis vos malignos spiritus et dæmones effugetis.

baptized in health, when they afterward fell into sin, were tormented with the unclean spirit returning upon them: whence it was apparent that the devil was excluded in baptism by the faith of the believer, but if afterward his faith failed, the devil returned to his old possession.'

From this discourse of Cyprian we learn, not only that energumens in time of extremity were admitted to baptism, but that baptism in such cases was many times a peculiar benefit to them, whilst it delivered them from the possession of unclean spirits, which could not before be cast out by any power of the exorcists, though in those days the power of exorcism was a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost.

No slave to be baptized without the testimony of his master.

4. Another observation to be made upon the baptism of adult persons is in relation to such as were slaves to Christian masters. For we find by the author of the Constitutions under the name of the Apostles[39], that in the examination of the several qualifications of those that offered themselves to baptism, one part of the inquiry was, 'Whether they were slaves or freemen? If they were slaves to an Heathen, they were only taught their obligations to please their master, that the word of God might not be blasphemed; and the master had no further concern in their baptism, as being himself an infidel: but if the master were a Christian, then the testimony of the master was first to be required concerning the life and conversation of his slave, before he could be admitted to the privilege of baptism. If he gave a laudable account of him, he was received: if otherwise, he was rejected, till he approved himself to his master.' So far in those days it was thought necessary and serviceable to religion to grant Christian masters a power over their slaves, that without their testimony and approbation they could not be accepted as fit candidates of baptism. Not that this was intended to countenance any tyrannical power in Christian masters, to debar their slaves of baptism, and deny them the privilege and benefits of the Christian religion, which is a piece of barbarous cruelty, and spiritual tyranny over

[39] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 412.) *Ἐξεταζέσθωσαν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ τρόποι, καὶ ὁ βίος, καὶ εἰ δοῦλοί εἰσιν ἢ ἐλεύθεροι· καὶ ἐὰν πιστοῦ δοῦλος ᾖ, ἐρωτάσθω ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ, εἰ μαρτυρεῖ αὐτῷ· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ, ἀποβαλλέσθω ἕως ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἄξιον ἐπιδείξῃ τῷ δεσπότῃ· εἰ δὲ μαρτυρεῖ αὐτῷ, προσδεχέσθω· εἰ δὲ ἐθνικοῦ ᾖ οἰκέτης, διδασκέσθω εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ δεσπότῃ, ἵνα μὴ βλασφημῆται ὁ λόγος.*

men's souls, unknown to former ages: but the design was to preserve the purity of religion, and keep back hypocritical and profane pretenders from the holy mysteries; the over-hasty admission of whom might prove a scandal and disgrace to the profession, if persons of a doubtful life were indiscriminately and indifferently admitted to the sacred rites of it. This caution wisely lodged an useful power in the hands of Christian masters, which prudence and charity directed them to use soberly to edification, and not to destruction. And experience proved it to be an useful rule: for it both made the masters zealous for the salvation of their slaves, as we have seen in the instance of the African Negro mentioned in Fulgentius; and also made the slaves sincere in their professions and pretences to religion, when they knew they could not be accepted as real converts, worthy of baptism, without the corroborating testimony of their masters. There were also laws of the State obliging all masters to take care of their families, so far as to see that every individual person, slaves as well as children, were made Christians; and, in default of this, some penalties were annexed[40], depriving the masters of certain privileges in the commonwealth, if they were found either remiss, or acting by collusion in this part of their duty. So that all imaginable obligation was laid upon masters, both in point of interest, duty, and charity, to take care of the instruction of their slaves, and bring them with their own testimonials to Christian baptism.

Yet baptism to be a voluntary act, and no one to be compelled by force to receive it.

5. Yet because baptism was to be a voluntary act in adult persons, some laws were made against compelling any one by force to receive it. In the fourth Council of Toledo, a canon was made to this purpose concerning the Jews, who had sometimes been drawn by force to be baptized against their will, and it was ordered by the synod[41], 'that thenceforth no one should

[40] See ch. 4. s. 19. p. 74.

[41] C.56. [al.57.] (t.5. p.1719 b.) De Judæis autem præcepit sancta synodus, nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre. *Cui enim vult Deus miseretur, et quem vult indurat.* Non enim tales inviti salvandi sunt, sed volentes, ut integra sit forma justitiæ: sicut enim homo propria arbitrii voluntate Serpenti obediens periit, sic, vocante se gratia Dei, propriæ mentis conversione homo quisque credendo salvatur. Ergo non vi, sed libera arbitrii voluntate, [al. facultate] ut convertantur, suadendi sunt, non potius impellendi. Qui autem jam pridem ad Christianitatem venire coacti sunt; sicut factum est temporibus religiosissimi Principis Sisebuti, [al. Sisenandi,] [Male.

be compelled by force to profess the Christian faith: for "God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth;" for such are not to be saved against their will, but of their own free consent, that the form or method of their justification may be perfect. For as man perished by his own free will, obeying the Serpent, so every man is saved, when he is called by the grace of God, by his own voluntary act of faith, and conversion of his own mind: therefore they are not to be compelled by force, but to be persuaded by their own free will to be converted. But as to those who have heretofore been forced to embrace Christianity, as was done in the time of the religious prince Sisebutus, or Sisenandus, for as much as they have been partakers of the sacraments, and have received the grace of baptism, and the unction of chrism, and the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, therefore they ought to be obliged to hold the faith, which they were compelled by force or necessity to receive, lest the name of the Lord should be blasphemed, and the faith which they have received be vilified and exposed to contempt.' By this we learn, that baptism was always to be a voluntary act in adult persons, and none were to be compelled against their own wills to receive it: and though the Church did not rescind such actions as were done against this rule, yet she did not approve them, but thought them worthy of her censure, and unfit to be made a precedent for the future.

That which looks most like force in this case allowed by law was the orders of Justinian mentioned before[42], one of which appoints Heathens and the other Samaritans to be baptized, with their wives and children and servants, under pain of confiscation. But even these laws did not compel them to be baptized against their wills, but allowed them two years' time to be catechumens, and admitted none but such as made a voluntary profession of their faith and repentance. For the penalties were only designed to prevent fraud and prevarications, in

vid. annot. marginal. ad loc. ap. Labb. ut supr. Ed.] quia jam constat eos sacramentis divinis sociatos, et baptismi gratiam suscepisse [al. percepisse], et chrismate unctos esse, et corporis Domini et sanguinis exstitisse participes, oportet etiam ut fidem, quam vi vel necessitate susceperunt, tenere cogantur; ne nomen Domini [al. divinum] blasphemetur, et fides, quam susceperunt, vilis ac contemptibilis habeatur.

[42] See ch. 4. s. 19. p. 74. n. 24.

such as pretended to receive baptism themselves, but in the mean time took no care to have their families made Christian: against whom the wisdom of the State then thought no laws severe enough could be enacted. So that these laws were tempered with the greatest prudence, between the extremes of rigour and remissness, that men might be made sensible on the one hand of their obligations to become Christians, and yet none have reason to complain on the other hand, that they were forced by violence to embrace a religion against their wills, which they could not approve and assent to. For the penalties, as I said, were only designed to chastise the hypocritical practices and fraudulent remissness of manifest prevaricators. And it were to be wished, that all civil governments and states in all ages would enact such laws, and put them duly in execution, against such sort of Christians, who instead of encouraging their slaves to be baptized, are the only obstacles to hinder and deprive them of the benefit of Christian baptism.

What persons were rejected from baptism. With a particular account of some certain trades and vocations, which kept men from it. Such were image-makers and stage-players.

6. I have one thing more to note concerning adult persons, who might or might not be admitted to baptism: and that is, that all such Heathens as made their livelihood out of any scandalous trades or professions, which could not be allowed by the rules of Christianity, were rejected from baptism, till they solemnly promised to bid adieu to, and actually forsook such vocations.

The author of the Apostolical Constitutions[43] specifies several of this nature, such as the πορνοβοσκοὶ, *panders*, or *procurers;* πόρναι, *whores;* εἰδωλοποιοὶ, *makers of images*, or *idols;* against whom Tertullian has also a particular dissertation, where he censures this trade as inconsistent with the profession of Christianity, telling men, that by this art they made the devils their *alumni*, (their *pupils*,) to whom they were a sort of foster-fathers, whilst they furnished out materials to carry on their service. 'And with what confidence,' says he[44], 'can any man exorcize his own *alumni*, (those devils,) whose service he makes his own house a shop or armoury to maintain?'

[43] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 412.) Εἴ τις πορνοβοσκός, ἢ πανσάσθω τοῦ μαστροπεύειν, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω· πόρνη προσιοῦσα, ἢ πανσάσθω, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω· εἰδωλοποιὸς προσιὼν, ἢ πανσάσθω, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω.

[44] De Idolol. c. 11. (p. 92 a.) Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos, quibus domum suam cellariam præstat?

reflecting on this unlawful trade of making images for the idol-temples.

Next to these in the Constitutions follow οἱ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, *actors* and *stage-players*, who could not stick to that profession, and be admitted to Christian baptism, because a great deal both of lewdness and idolatry was actually committed or encouraged by such as made a livelihood of that profession. The Canons therefore forbad all such to be baptized, and excommunicated those that fell to the trade again after baptism. 'If a soothsayer or a stage-player,' says the Council of Eliberis[45], 'have a mind to become believers, (that is, to be baptized,) let them be received, on condition they first bid adieu to their arts, and return not to them again: which if they attempt to do against this prohibition, they shall be cast out of the Church.' In like manner the third Council of Carthage[46] appoints all such to be excommunicated, and not to be reconciled or received again to favour but upon their conversion. And in the time of Cyprian, not only public actors, but private teachers and masters of this scandalous art were debarred the communion of the Church: as appears from Cyprian's answer to Eucratius[47], who put this question to him,—Whether a stage-player might communicate, who continued to follow that dishonourable trade by teaching children that pernicious art, which he was master of? To which Cyprian replies, 'That it was neither agreeable to the majesty of God, nor the discipline of the Gospel, that the modesty and honour of the Church should be defiled with so

[45] C. 62. (t. 1. p. 977 b.) Si augur [al. auriga] aut pantomimus credere voluerint, placuit, ut prius actibus [al. artibus] suis renuncient, et tunc demum suscipiantur, ita ut ulterius non revertantur. Quod si facere contra interdictum tentaverint, projiciantur ab ecclesia.

[46] C. 35. (t. 2. p. 1172 b.) Ut scenicis atque histrionibus, cæterisque hujusmodi personis vel apostaticis, conversis vel reversis ad Dominum, gratia vel reconciliatio non negetur.

[47] Ep. 61. [al. 2.] p. 3. (p. 171.) Consulendum me existimasti,...quid mihi videatur de histrione quodam, qui apud vos constitutus, in ejusdem adhuc artis suæ dedecore perseverat, et magister et doctor non erudiendorum, sed perdendorum puerorum, id quod male didicit, cæteris quoque insinuat; an talis debeat communicare nobiscum? Puto nec majestati divinæ, nec evangelicæ disciplinæ congruere, ut pudor et honor ecclesiæ tam turpi et infami contagione fœdetur. Nam cum in Lege prohibeantur viri induere muliebrem vestem, et maledicti ejusmodi judicentur; quanto majoris est criminis non tantum muliebria indumenta accipere, sed et gestus quoque turpes, et molles, et muliebres, magisterio impudicæ artis exprimere?

base and infamous a contagion. For if the Law prohibited men to wear women's apparel, and laid a curse upon all that did it; how much greater was the crime, not only to wear their clothes but to express their loose, and wanton, and effeminate gestures, by teaching this immodest art to others?' Indeed, this kind of life was scandalous even among the wise and sober part of the very Heathens. Tertullian observes[48], 'that they who professed these arts were noted with infamy, degraded and denied many privileges, driven from court, from pleading, from the senate, from the order of knighthood, and all other honours in the Roman city and commonwealth.' Which is also confirmed by St. Austin[49], who says, 'no actor was ever allowed to enjoy the freedom, or any other honourable privilege of a citizen of Rome.' Therefore since this was so infamous and scandalous a trade even among the Heathens, it is no wonder the Church would admit none of this calling to baptism, without obliging them first to bid adieu to so ignominious a profession. To have done otherwise, had been to expose herself to reproach, and to have given occasion to the adversary to blaspheme; if men of such lewd and profligate practices had been admitted to the privileges of the Church, who were excluded from the liberties of the city, and honours of the commonwealth.

And gladiators, charioteers, and other gamesters.

7. The next that are prohibited in the Constitutions[50], are charioteers and gladiators, and racers, and curators of the common games, practicers in the Olympic games, minstrels, harpers, dancers, vintners, and such like, who were commanded either to quit these callings, or to be rejected from baptism.

It may seem a little strange, that some of these callings, which seem indifferent in their own nature, and are now commonly allowed, should then be thought just reasons to debar

[48] De Spectacul. c. 22. (p. 82 b.) ... Damnant ignominia et capitis minutione, arcentes curia, rostris, senatu, equite, cæterisque honoribus omnibus simul ac ornamentis.

[49] De Civitat. Dei, l. 2. c. 14. (t. 7. p. 42 b.) ... Isti actores poeticarum fabularum removent a societate civitatis, ... ab honoribus omnibus repellunt homines scenicos.

[50] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 412.) ... Ἡνίοχος, ἢ μονομάχος, ἢ σταδιοδρόμος, ἢ λουδεμπιστὴς, ἢ Ὀλυμπικὸς, ἢ χοραύλης, ἢ κιθαριστὴς, ἢ λυριστὴς, ἢ ὁ τὴν ὄρχησιν ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ἢ κάπηλος, ἢ παυσάσθωσαν, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθωσαν.

men from baptism. But it is to be supposed, that these arts in the time of Heathenism were instrumental in carrying on idolatry, lewdness, and profaneness, and therefore by the Ancients, whose discipline was exact, were thought improper to be allowed in the practice of a Christian. The Circensian games were in honour of the gods, and therefore to be concerned in them as a charioteer, was still to partake in idolatry: upon which account the first Council of Arles [51] orders all such to be excommunicated as continued after baptism in this service. And there is a remarkable story told by St. Jerom in the Life of Hilarion [52], concerning one of these charioteers, an Heathen of the city of Gaza, 'who, being struck by the Devil with a dead palsy, as he was driving his chariot, so that he could not move his hand, nor neck, but only his tongue to prayer, in this condition was brought in a bed to Hilarion, who told him, that he could not be healed unless he would believe in Jesus, and promise to bid adieu to his former trade. The man immediately upon this believed, renounced, and was healed, rejoicing more for the salvation of his soul than his body.' This calling ministered to idolatry, and upon that score a renunciation of it was so precisely exacted of men at their baptism. The gladiator's art was infamous for its barbarity and cruelty, involving men in murder and bloodshed, and therefore utterly inconsistent with the rules of Christianity. The racers, and curators of the public games, and Olympic combatants, were all concerned in idolatrous practices; for these games also were held in the name and to the honour of some idol-god; which calling was therefore to be renounced, as an appendage to idolatry, before men came to baptism. For the other trades, of minstrels, harpers, dancers, &c., besides their ministering to levity, vanity, and luxury, they were also employed in idol-worship and other profaneness, which seems to have been the principal reason of

[51] C. 4. (t. 1. p. 1427 d.) De agitatoribus, qui fideles sunt, placuit eos, quamdiu agitant, a communione separati.

[52] C. 13. (t. 2. p. 20 a.) Auriga quoque Gazensis, in curru percussus a dæmone, totus obriguit, ita ut nec manum agitare, nec cervicem posset reflectere. Delatus ergo in lecto, cum solam linguam moveret ad preces, audivit non prius posse sanari, quam crederet in Iesum, et se sponderet arti pristinæ renunciaturum. Credidit, spopondit, sanatus est, magisque de animæ quam de corporis salute exsultavit.

making such a strict prohibition of them in the subsequent life of every Christian.

Astrologers and practisers of other curious arts.

8. The next sort of persons mentioned in the Constitutions[53], as unworthy of baptism, are lascivious persons, with all practisers of curious arts, as magicians, enchanters, astrologers, diviners, magical charmers, idle and wandering beggars, makers of amulets and phylacteries, and such as dealt in heathenish lustrations, soothsayers, and observers of signs and omens, interpreters of palpitations, observers of accidents in meeting others, making divination thereupon, as upon a blemish in the eye, or in the feet, observers of the motion of birds or weasels, observers of voices and symbolical sounds. All these are appointed to be examined and tried a considerable time, whether they would relinquish their arts or not; if they did, they might be received; if not, they were to be rejected from baptism.

The names of those curious arts which I have expressed in the margin, are some of them difficult to be understood. The λώταγες are explained by St. Chrysostom[54], to be *idle wandering beggars*, given to spend what they got in gaming and luxury: but others make them a sort of *diviners*, or *fortune-tellers*, like our gipsies, which is most agreeable to this place. The περιάμματα were the same with the *phylacteria*, which were amulets made of ribands, with a text of Scripture, or some other charm of words written in them, and hanged about the neck to cure diseases, and preserve men from danger, whence they had the name of *phylacteries* or *preservatives*. Now this was a piece of heathenish superstition and idolatry,

[53] L. 8. c. 38. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 413.) Ἀρρητοποιὸς, κίναιδος, βλὰξ, μάγος, ἐπαοιδὸς, ἀστρολόγος, μάντις, θηρεπῳδὸς, λώταξ, ὀχλαγωγὸς, περιάμματα ποιῶν, περικαθαίρων, οἰωνιστὴς, συμβολοδείκτης, παλμῶν ἑρμηνεὺς, φυλαττόμενος ἐν συναντήσει λώβας ὄψεως, ἢ ποδῶν, ἢ ὀρνίθων, ἢ γαλῶν, ἢ ἐπιφωνήσεων, ἢ παρακροαμάτων συμβολικῶν, χρόνῳ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν· . . . παυσάμενοι οὖν προσδεχέσθωσαν, μὴ πειθόμενοι δὲ ἀποβαλλέσθωσαν.

[54] Hom. 13. in Eph. (t. 11. p. 99 c.) Οὐχ ὁρᾷς τούτους τοὺς προσαιτοῦντας, οὓς λώταγας ἡμῖν ἔθος καλεῖν; πῶς περιΐασι; πῶς καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐλεοῦμεν; ἀλλ' ὅμως τούτοις οὐδὲ συγγνώμη τίς ἐστιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ συγγινώσκομεν αὐτοῖς, ὅταν κυβεύοντες ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἀπολλύωσι. [See Dindorf's edition of Stephanus's Thesaurus (Paris. 1842–1846. v. 5. p. 474.) with reference to this passage; as well as Cotelerius's annotation on the term λώταξ in the preceding citation from the Constitutions. I do not find authority for the sense, which the Author says others give to λώταγες as meaning *diviners* or *fortune-tellers*, though secondarily such a notion might by some writers be attached to the term. Ed.]

which stuck closest to new converts, and was most difficult to be cured. Therefore we find the ancient Canons and Fathers very severe in their censures and invectives against it. The Council of Laodicea[55] condemns clergymen that pretended to make such phylacteries, which were truly the bonds and fetters of their own souls, and orders all such as wore them to be cast out of the Church. The Council of Trullo[56] decrees six years' penance for such offenders. St. Chrysostom[57] declaims against it as gross idolatry, whatever little pleas were brought in favour of it. 'The use of amulets to hang about the neck,' says he, 'is idolatry, though they that gain by it offer a thousand philosophical arguments to defend it, saying, We only pray to God, and do nothing more; and, The old woman that made them was a Christian and a believer; with other such like excuses:' notwithstanding all which he threatens to excommunicate all such as were found to practise it. So that as this was a crime deserving excommunication in all that were already batpized, it was thought also a just reason to prohibit any from coming to baptism, who would not first promise to renounce it.

Frequenters of the public games and theatre.

9. Another sort of persons whom the author of the Constitutions excludes from the privilege of baptism, are frequenters of the public games and theatres. 'If any man's mind,' [says

[55] C. 36. (t. 1. p. 1504 b.) Οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικοὺς ἢ κληρικοὺς .... ποιεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα φυλακτήρια, ἅτινά ἐστι δεσμωτήρια τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν· τοὺς δὲ φοροῦντας ῥίπτεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκελεύσαμεν.

[56] C. 61. (t. 6. p. 1170 c.) ... Ὑπὸ τὸν κανόνα πιπτέτωσαν τῆς ἑξαετίας· τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ τούτῳ ἐπιτιμίῳ καθυβάλλεσθαι δεῖ .... καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους νεφοδιώκτας, καὶ γοητευτὰς, καὶ φυλακτηρίους, καὶ μάντεις.

[57] Hom. 8. in Coloss. p. 1374. (t. 11. p. 387 a.) Τὰ γὰρ περίαπτα, κἂν μυρία φιλοσοφῶσιν οἱ ἐκ τούτων χρηματιζόμενοι, λέγοντες, ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν καλοῦμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν πλέον ποιοῦμεν, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, καὶ Χριστιανή ἐστιν ἡ γραῦς καὶ πιστὴ, εἰδωλολατρεία τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστιν. .... Ἰδοὺ λέγω, καὶ προλέγω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐάν τις ἁλῶ, οὐ φείσομαι πάλιν, ἄν τε περίαπτον, ἄν τε ἐπῳδὴν, ἄν τε ἄλλο τι τῆς τέχνης τῆς τοιαύτης ποιῇ.—In Ps. 110. (t. 5. p. 104 c.) Μὴ πάντως σωθῆναι ζητήσωμεν, μὴ πάντως ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῶν δεινῶν παντὶ τρόπῳ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Θεόν. Τοῦτο δὲ λέγω διὰ τοὺς ἐπαοιδαῖς χρωμένους ἐν ταῖς νόσοις, καὶ ἑτέρας μαγγανείας ἐπιζητοῦντας εἰς παραμυθίαν τῆς ἀρρωστίας.—Hom. 6. adv. Jud. (t. 1. p. 684 a.) Ἂν μέν τοι καρτερήσῃς μικρὸν, καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους ἢ ἐπάσαι τινὰ ἐπῳδὴν, ἢ περιάψαι τὶ τῷ σώματι περίαπτον, ἀτιμάσῃς, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ἐξαγάγῃς τῆς ὕβρεως ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας, εὐθέως ἔλαβες δρόσον ἀπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος.—Basil. in Ps. 45. [Vers. Anglic. Ps. 46.] (t. 1. part. 1. p. 244 c. n. 2.) Νοσεῖ τὸ παιδίον; καὶ σὺ τὸν ἐπαοιδὸν περισκοπεῖς, ἢ τὸν τοὺς περιέργους χαρακτῆρας τοῖς τραχήλοις τῶν ἀναιτίων νηπίων περιτιθέντα;

the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[57],] 'be addicted to the madness of the theatre, or huntings, or horse-racings, or other gymnastical sports and exercises, let him either leave them off or be rejected from baptism.' The learned Hieronymus Mercurialis[58] has an observation, that will explain the reason of this prohibition: for, in his curious discourse, *De Arte Gymnastica*, he observes, 'these several sorts of heathen games and plays were instituted upon a religious account, in honour of the gods, and men thought they were doing a grateful thing to them, whilst they were engaged in such exercises.' Therefore a Christian could not be present at them as a spectator, without partaking in some measure in the idolatry of them. Besides, there was a great deal of barbarity and cruelty, as well as lewdness and profaneness, committed in many of them, which it did not become a Christian eye to behold with pleasure and approbation. The theatre was looked upon as the Devil's propriety, and so he himself termed it, as we learn from that famous story in Tertullian[59], where, speaking of a Christian woman, who went to the theatre, and returned possessed with a devil, he says, 'The unclean spirit being asked by the exorcist, How he durst presume to make such an attempt upon a believer? replied confidently, That he had a right to her, because he found her upon his own ground.' For these reasons the ancient Canons and Fathers are so severe in their invectives against all theatrical exercises, not only in the actors, but also in the spectators, declaring them to be incompatible with the piety and purity of a Christian life. And upon this account men were obliged to renounce them before they could be admitted to baptism. But of this something more when we come to the form of renunciation.

In what cases the military

10. The several sorts of persons hitherto mentioned were excluded from baptism without exception: but there are two

[57] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 414.) *Θεατρομανία εἴ τις πρόσκειται, ἢ κυνηγίοις, ἢ ἱπποδρομίοις, ἢ ἀγῶσιν, ἢ παυσάσθω, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω.*

[58] De Arte Gymnast. l. 1. c. 3. (p. 12.)... Ludorum finis erat religio quædam, qua antiqui opinabantur sese Diis rem gratam illis ludis tanquam promissam facturos.

[59] De Spectacul. c. 26. (p. 83 b.) .... Theatrum adiit, et inde cum dæmonio rediit. Itaque exorcismo cum oneraretur immundus spiritus, quod ausus esset fidelem aggredi; Constanter et justissime quidem, inquit, feci, in meo eam inveni.

other kinds or states of life that must be considered with some distinction, that is, the military life, and the state of concubinage, as it is called sometimes in the Civil Law and ancient Canons. Some learned persons[60] are of opinion, that the Ancients had so much dislike to the military life, as to excommunicate such as bore arms after baptism: which they affirm upon the authority of the Nicene Fathers, to whom they impute it as an error, that they condemned absolutely the military life as unlawful, which St. John Baptist had approved. But this charge is grounded merely upon a mistake and misunderstanding of the meaning of those Fathers, who had no intent to condemn the military life in general, but only as it might happen to be unlawful in some particular circumstances and cases. The words of the canon[61] referred to are these: 'If any, who at first by the grace of God made confession of the faith, and cast away the military girdle, afterward return to their vomit again, so as to give money and buy a place in the army, let them be ten years among the prostrators, after they have been three years among the hearers.' The generality of interpreters take this to refer to the times of Licinius the persecutor, who by an edict had ordered all such Christian soldiers to be cashiered as would not sacrifice to the gods; upon which many Christians in the army threw away their girdles, and quitted the military life. But afterward some of them returned to it upon the conditions proposed, doing sacrifice and committing idolatry, and giving money to regain their places; against whose prevarication and revolt the discipline of this canon was intended. So Balsamon and Zonaras among the old expositors[62]; and so Grotius[63], Ziegler[64], Sylvius[65],

life might unqualify men for baptism.

[60] Scultetus, Discuss. Quæst. de C. Nicæn. in Medulla Patr. part. 1. p. 477. (ad calc. part. 1. pp. 526, 527. Ed. 1603.) Quæst. 7. *An Concilium Nicænum alicubi errarit?* Errores duo manifesti sunt.... Rursum, canone 12, prohibent eos redire ad militiam, qui cingulum abjecissent, &c.

[61] C. Nicæn. c. 12. (t. 2. p. 34 e.) *Οἱ δὲ προσκληθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος, καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὁρμὴν ἐνδειξάμενοι, καὶ ἀποθέμενοι τὰς ζώνας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον ἔμετον ἀναδραμόντες, ὥς τινας καὶ ἀργύρια προΐεσθαι, καὶ βενεφικίοις κατορθῶσαι τὸ στρατεύεσθαι· οὗτοι δέκα ἔτη ὑποπιπτέτωσαν, μετὰ τὸν τῆς τριετοῦς ἀκροάσεως χρόνον.*

[62] [Vid. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 1. pp. 71, 72. Ed.]

[63] De Jure Belli, l. 1. c. 2. p. 36. [s. 10. n. 8.] (Oper. v. 1. p. 67.) Agitur [in c. 12. C. Nicæn.] haud dubie de idololatria: nam quæ canone 11. præcesserat mentio temporum Licinii, in hoc canone repetita tacite haberi debet, ut sæpe canonum sequentium sensus a prioribus pendet.

Coriolanus[66], Binius[67], and Bishop Beveridge[68], with many other modern writers. Albaspinæus[69] thinks it peculiarly respected such penitents only as vowed to renounce all secular business and employments, and to live in a state of perpetual penance, but afterward returned to a secular life, and took upon them civil offices again, which in the imperial law and canons of the Church are sometimes called by the name of *militia palatina.* And Salmasius[70] advances an opinion not much different from this. However it is agreed on all hands, that the Council of Nice made no general prohibition of the

Vide in exemplum canonem 11. Concilii Eliberini. Licinius autem, verba sunt Eusebii, *στρατιώτας ἐκέλευεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τοῦ ἀξιώματος, εἰ μὴ τοῖς δαίμοσι θύειν αἱροῖντο,—milites militia exuebat, nisi Diis sacrificare vellent,*—quod et Julianus postea imitatus est; quam ob causam Victricius atque alii cingulum pro Christo abjecisse leguntur.... Quare his, qui semel conscientia puncti cingulum abjecerant, reditus ad militiam sub Licinio non patebat, nisi per fidei Christianæ abnegationem: quæ quia eo erat gravior, quo prior iste actus majorem in illis legis divinæ cognitionem testabatur, ideo hi defectores gravius etiam puniuntur, quam illi, de quibus egerat præcedens canon, qui sine periculo vitæ aut facultatum amittendarum Christianismum abjecerant. Generaliter autem de omni militia interpretari canonem, quem produximus, ab omni ratione alienum est. Aperte enim testatur historia, his, qui sub Licinio militiam abjecerant, neque Licinio imperante ad eam redierant, ne fidem Christianam violarent, a Constantino datam optionem, immunesne esse a militia vellent, an ad militiam redire? quod haud dubie multi fecerunt.

[64] Animadv. in Grot. l. 1. c. 2. (p. 105.) Magis igitur erit, ut Hugonis Grotii partes sequamur, et de illis canonem accipiamus, qui in militiam denuo iverunt cum abnegatione fidei jam agnitæ.

[65] [Annot. ad Caranz. Summ. Omn. Concil., &c., Genev. 1600. 8vo. Ed.]

[66] [Summa Conciliorum Omnium, &c. Antwerp. 1623. fol. sive Paris. 1645. fol. Ed.]

[67] [Not. ad calc. C. Nicæn. ap. Labb. (ubi supr. p. 75 a.)... Unam ob causam cum plures Christianorum militum ardore fidei cingulum abjicerent, sine honore potius quam fide vivere malentes; ac demum, postea quam mundi et honoris tentationibus devicti essent, iidem cingulum, parati deinceps fidem ejurare, vicissim ambirent; Concilium iisdem severam hanc pœnitentiam imposuit. Vid. Bellarmin. libr. 2. de Concil. c. 8. Ed.]

[68] [Annot. in eund. can. ad calc. Pandect. t. 2. p. 77. Ed.]

[69] Not. in c. 12. C. Nicæn. (t. 2. p. 79 c.) Mihi... persuasum est, canone isto designari lapsos pœnitentes, quos, benedictione percepta, sæcularium sumptoque habitu, posthabitaque rerum omnium ac munerum militarium, et fori cura ac cogitatione, voti postea pœnituisset: idque quod professi fuerant repetentes, commutationis vitæ tædio quodam affecti, animum et cogitationem ad munera illa sæcularia rursus adjecissent.

[70] De Fœnere Trapezitico, p. 782, cited by Ziegler, (p. 105.) Novissime Claudius Salmasius [verba sunt Ziegleri] *de Fœn. Trapezit.* p. 782, verba canonis simpliciter accipit de iis, qui, gratia inspirante divina, cingulo militiæ deposito, quo melius et perfectius vitæ institutum magisque Christianum capesserent, postmodo illud resumpserunt, et denuo se militiæ sacramento obligarunt.

military life, but only in some such special cases. There is therefore no reason to conclude from hence that they esteemed the vocation of a soldier simply unlawful. Especially considering that Constantine himself allowed the soldiers, who were cashiered by Licinius, to return to their ancient employment again, as is rightly observed by Ziegler[71] out of Eusebius. Nay, the first Council of Arles[72] excommunicated all such as threw away their arms in time of peace, on pretence that they were Christians.

All which abundantly proves that the ancient canons did not condemn the military life as a vocation simply unlawful or anti-christian, nor consequently such as men were obliged to renounce at their baptism: but all that was required of them was only what St. John Baptist had exacted before, when they came to his baptism, as appears from the rule in the Constitutions[73] providing in this case, 'that a soldier, when he desired baptism, should be taught to do violence to no man, to accuse no one falsely, and to be content with his wages; if he consented to these things, he was to be received; if otherwise, to be rejected.' This was the standing rule of the Church, and I believe there is no instance of any man being refused baptism merely because he was a soldier, unless some unlawful circumstance, as that of idolatry, or the like, made the vocation sinful.

Whether persons might be baptized, who lived in the state of concubinage.

11. The other case, which has been matter of doubt, is concerning the state of concubinage, which in the common acceptation is a matter of such ill fame, that it seems a wonder to many to hear of any allowance made to it in the Civil Law and ancient Canons. But they made a distinction anciently in this matter, as the Jews and patriarchs of old did, among whom there was one sort of concubines which was permitted, as dif-

[71] Ibid. ubi supra.—Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. 2. c. 33. (v. 1. p. 532. 24.) Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐξετασθεῖσι μὲν ἐπὶ στρατιωτικαῖς ἀξίαις ποτὲ, τούτων δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀπηνῆ τε καὶ ἄδικον πρόφασιν ἐκπεσοῦσιν, ὅτι τὸ γινώσκειν τὸ κρεῖττον ὁμολογοῦντες, προὐτίμησαν ἧς εἶχον ἀξίας, αἱρετὸν ἔστω πρὸς βούλησιν, ἢ τὰ στρατιωτικὰ στέργουσιν ἐφ' οὗπερ ἦσαν σχήματος μένειν, ἢ μετὰ ἀφέσεως ἐντίμου ἐλευθέραν ἄγειν σχολήν.

[72] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 1427 d.) De his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstinere eos a communione.

[73] L. 8. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 413.) Στρατιώτης προσιὼν διδασκέσθω μὴ ἀδικεῖν, μὴ συκοφαντεῖν, ἀρκεῖσθαι δὲ τοῖς διδομένοις ὀψωνίοις· πειθόμενος προσδεχέσθω· ἀντιλέγων δὲ ἀποβαλλέσθω.

fering nothing from a wife, save only that she was not married with all the solemnities and usual forms that the other was: and this sort of concubines the ancient Canons received both to baptism and the communion. The rule in the Constitutions[74] about this matter is given thus: 'A concubine, that is a slave to an infidel, if she keep herself only to him, may be received to baptism; but, if she commit fornication with others, she shall be rejected.' A like decree was made in the Council of Toledo[75] concerning the admission of persons to the communion: 'If any Christian, who has a wife, have also a concubine, let him not communicate. But if he have no wife, but only a concubine instead of a wife, he may not be repelled from the communion, provided he be content to be joined to one woman only, whether wife or concubine, as he pleases.'

Now the difference betwixt such a concubine and a wife, as learned men[76] have observed, was not, that the one was truly married, and the other not; but in the different way of their being married. For she, that was called a wife, was married publicly, and with great solemnity, and instruments of dowry, and other ceremonies, which the civil and canon law required. But she, who was called a concubine, was one married in a private way without the solemnity which the law required. Yet they both agreed in these three things; 1. That they were unmarried persons before. 2. That they obliged themselves to their husbands to live in conjugal chastity, and in procreation of children, and be joined to no other. 3. And that they

[74] L. 8. c. 32. (ibid.) Παλλακή τινος ἀπίστου δούλη, ἐκείνῳ μόνῳ σχολάζουσα, προσδεχέσθω· εἰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους ἀσελγαίνει, ἀποβαλλέσθω.

[75] C. 17. (t. 2. p. 1226 b.) Si quis habens uxorem fidelis, [al. fidelem,] si concubinam habeat, non communicet. Cæterum is, qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habeat, a communione non repellatur, tantum ut unius mulieris, aut uxoris, aut concubinæ, ut ei placuerit, sit conjunctione contentus.

[76] Vide Anton. August. de Emend. Gratian. l. 1. dialog. 15. (p. 170.) Non ignoro, duplex esse concubinarum genus, duplex etiam uxorum. Uxores, quæ sine dotalibus instrumentis acciperentur, eas concubinas dictas fuisse. De his possumus Tolentani Concilii verba interpretari.—Vid. Petr. Martyr. Loc. Commun. l. 1. class. 2. c. 10. n. 3. n. 2. p. 273. (p. 192 a. 9.) Concubina est, quæ cum cœlibe consuetudinem conjugalem habet. Sed quia ea non est individua, quoniam ita conjuncti facile separantur, ideo concubina plurimum a vera uxore distat: deinde cum ea humana jura non communicantur. Non enim concubina in familiam ejus transit, cum quo consuevit. Quin et res et facultates minime communicantur; nec filii, ex ea conjunctione orti, legitimi et justi heredes habentur, nisi beneficio principis legitimati fuerint, &c.

would continue faithful in this state all their lives. Now this sort of concubines, being in the nature of wives married without the formalities required in the Civil Law, were not reputed guilty of fornication, though they wanted the privileges, rights, and honours, that the law allowed to those who were called legal wives: and therefore they were admitted to baptism without any further obligation, in case the husband was an Heathen. But if the husband was a Christian, the rule in the Constitution made a little difference. For[77] if he had a concubine, he was obliged to dismiss her, and marry a lawful wife, if his concubine was a slave; and if she was a free-woman, he must make her a lawful wife; otherwise he was to be cast out of the Church. And so in the Decrees of Pope Leo[78], Christians, who had only concubines, were obliged to dismiss them, if they were slaves, unless they would free them, and lawfully endow them, and give them a public marriage as the laws required. And in this these Decrees seem to differ from that of the Council of Toledo, which allows a concubine to cohabit in private wedlock without any ecclesiastical censure. St. Austin[79] reckons this case one of those dubious and difficult points which cannot easily be determined. But he inclines to think a concubine of this kind might be admitted to baptism, because her case differs much from that of a professed adulteress, who could never be admitted to baptism whilst she lived in the practice of so flagrant a crime; but the other case, he thinks, is a matter which the Scripture has nowhere so positively condemned, but rather left in doubt, as many other such points and questions, which the Church in her prudence must decide by the best skill she has to determine such difficult questions.

I have represented the sense of the Ancients upon this point

[77] Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 32. (ibid.) *Πιστὸς, ἐὰν ἔχῃ παλλακὴν, εἰ μὲν δούλην, πανσάσθω, καὶ νόμῳ γαμείτω. εἰ δὲ ἐλευθέραν, ἐκγαμείτω αὐτὴν νόμῳ. εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀποβαλλέσθω.*

[78] Ep. 92. ad Rustic. n. 4. (CC. t. 3. p. 1406 d.) .... Clericus, si filiam viro habenti concubinam in matrimonium dederit, non ita accipiendum est, quasi conjugato ei dederit, nisi forte illa mulier et ingenua facta, et dotata legitime, et publicis nuptiis honestata videatur.—Ibid. n. 6 (e.) Ancillam a toro abjicere, et uxorem certæ ingenuitatis accipere, non duplicatio conjugii, sed profectus est honestatis.

[79] De Fide et Operibus, c. 19. t. 4. p. 33. (t. 6. p. 185 d.) De concubina quoque, si professa fuerit nullum se alium cognituram, etiamsi ab illo, cui subdita est, dimittatur: merito dubitatur, utrum ad percipiendum baptismum non debeat admitti.

as clearly as I could, because it has occasioned some ill-grounded censures of the Ancients, and of Gratian's Canon Law, which is only copied from them, in some modern authors; as if they had allowed such concubines, as we commonly call harlots, to be baptized without giving signs of repentance: whereas, we see, this matter was not so crudely delivered by them, but considered and determined with several necessary cautions and distinctions. And I have been the more particular in making inquiries concerning these several kinds of adult persons, who might, or might not, be admitted to baptism, because these are questions, which the reader will not readily find so distinctly examined in modern writers, who have professedly treated of the subject of baptism.

A peculiar error of the Marcionites in rejecting all married persons from baptism.

12. I only note one thing more concerning a pretended rule of purity among the Marcionites, which was, that they would admit no married persons to their baptism; but they must be either virgins, or widows, or bachelors, or divorced persons: which, as Tertullian observes[75], came doubtless from their abhorrence and condemnation of the married life; which error was common to them with many other ancient heretics; though I do not find this peculiarity, of denying baptism to such persons, ascribed to any others. However it was, we are sure, there was no such rule ever made to discourage marriage in the Catholic Church. Her rule was always that of St. Paul, "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." [Hebr. 13, 4.] The Church took upon her to judge adulterers, and by the power of the keys to exclude them from baptism: but beyond this she pretended to no power, or commission from God, to be exercised over any others, whom God had left at liberty to be married or unmarried, as they saw occasion.

[75] Cont. Marcion. l. 1. c. 29. (p. 380 b.) Non tinguitur apud illum caro nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi cœlebs, nisi divortio baptisma mercata ... Sine dubio ex damnatione conjugii institutio ista constabit.

CHAP. VI.

Of the time and place of baptism.

1. Next to the persons who were the subjects of baptism, it will be proper to consider the circumstances of time and place in the administration of it.

Why adult persons sometimes delayed baptism by order of the Church.

As to infants, I have already shown, that no time was limited for their baptism; but they were to be regenerated as soon as they could with convenience after the time of their natural birth; being confined to no day, as circumcision was, by any rule of Scripture; though the Church in some places deferred them, when there was no danger of death, to the solemnity of some greater festival.

But for adult persons, the case was otherwise. For their baptism was generally deferred for two or three years, or a longer or shorter time, by order of the Church, till they could be sufficiently instructed, and disciplined to the practice of a Christian life; of which I have given a full account in the last Book. Others had their baptism put off a longer time by way of punishment, when they fell into gross and scandalous crimes, which were to be expiated by a longer course of discipline and repentance. This was sometimes five, or ten, or twenty years, or more, even all their lives to the hour of death, when their crimes were very flagrant and provoking. If a catechumen turned informer against his brethren in time of persecution, and any one was proscribed or slain by his means, then, by a canon of the Council of Eliberis[76], his baptism was to be deferred for five years. And so in case a woman-catechumen divorced herself from her husband[77], her punishment was five years' prorogation. But if she committed adultery, and after conception used any arts to destroy her infant in the womb, then she was to remain unbaptized all her life, and only to be ad-

[76] C. Eliber. c. 73. (t. 1. p. 978 b.) Delator si quis exstiterit fidelis, et per delationem ejus aliquis fuerit proscriptus vel interfectus, placuit, eum nec in fine accipere communionem. Si levior causa fuerit, intra quinquennium accipere poterit communionem. Si catechumenus fuerit, post quinquennii tempora admittatur ad baptismum.

[77] Ibid. c. 11. (p. 972 a.) Intra quinquennii tempora, catechumena si graviter fuerit infirmata, dandum ei baptismum placuit non denegari.

mitted[78] to baptism at the hour of death. From whence it is plain, that the baptism of adult persons was sometimes deferred a considerable time by order of the Church: but then this was always either by way of preparation or punishment, whilst catechumens were first learning the principles of religion, or were kept in a state of penance to make satisfaction to the Church for some scandalous transgression.

Private reasons for deferring baptism against the rules of the Church. 1. Supinity and negligence of salvation.

2. But others deferred their baptism of their own accord against the rules of the Church: of which practice there are frequent complaints in the writings of the Ancients, and severe invectives against it, answering the common pleas which men usually urged in their own behalf. Some did it out of a supine laziness and careless negligence of their salvation[79], which was a very common reason, but such an one as men were ashamed to own, because its own reproach was a sufficient answer to it.

2. An unwillingness to renounce the world, and submit to the severities of religion.

3. Others deferred it out of an heathenish principle still remaining in them; because they were in love with the world and its pleasures, which they were unwilling to renounce to take upon them the yoke of Christ, which they thought would lay greater restraints upon them, and deny them those liberties, which they could now more freely indulge themselves in, and securely enjoy. They could spend their lives in pleasure, and be baptized at last, and then they should gain as much as those that were baptized before; for the labourers, who came into the vineyard at the last hour, had the same reward as those that had borne the burden and heat of the day. Thus Gregory Nazianzen[80] brings them in, arguing for delaying

[78] Ibid. c. 68. (p. 977 e.) Catechumena si per adulterium conceperit, et conceptum necaverit [al. præfocaverit], placuit eam in fine baptizari.

[79] Vid. Greg. Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 654 a.) Ἕως ποτε, ὀκνηρὲ, κατάκεισαι; πότε δὲ ἐξ ὕπνου ἀναστήσῃ; τὸ καὶ τὸ σκήπτῃ, καὶ προφασίζῃ προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις· μένω τὰ φῶτα, κ. τ. λ.—Constit. Apost. l. 6. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 344.) Ὁ λέγων, ὅτι ὅταν τελευτῶ, βαπτίζομαι, ἵνα μὴ ἁμαρτήσω, καὶ ῥυπανῶ τὸ βάπτισμα, οὗτος ἄγνοιαν ἔχει Θεοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως ἐπιλήσμων τυγχάνει. Μὴ ἀναβάλλου γὰρ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς Κύριον· οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα.

[80] Ibid. (p. 650 b.) Ἀλλὰ τί μοι πλέον, φησὶ, προκατασχεθέντι διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὸ τερπνὸν τοῦ ζῆν ἐμαυτῷ διὰ τοῦ τάχους ἀποκλείσαντι, ἑνὸν ἐφεῖναι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, καὶ τηνικαῦτα τυχεῖν τῆς χάριτος; οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι προκεκμηκόσιν ὑπῆρξέ τι πλέον, ἴσου τοῦ μισθοῦ δοθέντος καὶ τοῖς τελευταίοις.—Ibid. (p. 652 a.) Τί δαί; Οὐχὶ φιλάνθρωπόν, φησι, τὸ θεῖον; Καὶ γνωστικὸν γὰρ ἐννοιῶν, δοκιμάζει τε τὴν ἔφεσιν, καὶ ἀντὶ βαπτίσματος ποιεῖται τὴν ὁρμὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος.

repentance. This reason was so very absurd and foolish, that many, who were governed by it, were ashamed to own it. But yet, as St. Basil[81] observes, 'though they did not speak a word, their actions sufficiently proclaimed it. For it was the same as if they had said, Let me alone, I will abuse the flesh to the enjoyment of all that is filthy; I will wallow in the mire of pleasures; I will embrue my hands in blood; I will take away other men's goods; live by deceit; forswear and lie; and then I will be baptized when I shall leave off sinning.' Such men 'had the idol of infidelity still in their hearts', as the author of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanus[82], charges them; and that was the true reason why they put off their baptism: for had they believed baptism to be necessary to all, whether just or unjust, they would have made haste to receive it, because the end of every man's life is utterly uncertain.

3. A fear of falling after baptism.

4. Another sort of men put off their baptism to the end of their lives upon a sort of Novatian principle; because they pretended to be afraid of falling into sin after baptism; and there was no second baptism allowed to regenerate men again to the kingdom of heaven; whereas, if they were baptized at the hour of death, heaven would be immediately open to them, and they might go pure and undefiled into it. In the mean time, if they died before baptism, they hoped God would accept the will for the deed, and the desire of baptism for baptism itself. Now, as this pretence was founded on abundance of

[81] Exhort. ad Baptizat. Hom. 13. t. 1. p. 414. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 164 e. n. 5.) Νοῷ γάρ σου τὴν ὑπέρθεσιν, κἂν περιστέλλῃ τοῖς ῥήμασιν· αὐτὰ βοᾷ τὰ πράγματα, κἂν τῇ φωνῇ σιωπᾷς· Ἔασον· ἀποχρήσωμαι τῇ σαρκὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν αἰσχρῶν· ἐγκυλισθῶ τῷ βορβόρῳ τῶν ἡδονῶν, αἱμάξω τὰς χεῖρας, ἀφέλωμαι τὰ ἀλλότρια, δολίως πορευθῶ, ἐπιορκήσω, ψεύσωμαι, καὶ τότε τὸ βάπτισμα, ὅταν λήξω ποτὲ τῶν κακῶν, ὑποδέξομαι.

[82] L. 6. n. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 551.) Confugite ergo ad aquas istas; solæ sunt enim, quæ possint vim futuri ignis extinguere: ad quas qui moratur accedere, constat in eo infidelitatis adhuc idolum permanere, et ab ipso prohiberi ad aquas, quæ salutem conferunt, properare. Sive enim justus sis, sive injustus, baptismus tibi per omnia necessarius est: justo quidem, ut adimpleatur in eo perfectio, et regeneretur Deo; injusto vero, ut peccatorum, quæ gessit in ignorantia, remissio concedatur. Omnibus ergo festinandum est sine mora renasci Deo; quia incertus est uniuscujusque exitus vitæ. [Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 13. in Hebr. p. 1848. Compare the passage as cited before, ch. 1. s. 4. p. 5. n. 14. The peroration of the Homily is wholly addressed to such as were for deferring baptism till death. Ed.]

errors, so the Ancients are copious in refuting them. St. Basil[83] argues against their practice from the uncertainty of life. 'For who,' says he, 'has fixed for thee the term of life? Who is it that can promise thee the enjoyment of old age? Who can undertake to be a sufficient sponsor of futurity? Do you not see both young and old suddenly snatched away? And why do you stay to make baptism only the gift of a fever?' Gregory Nazianzen[84] calls it 'a riddle, for an unbaptized man to think he is baptized in the sight of God, whilst he depends upon his mercy in the neglect of baptism; or to imagine himself in the kingdom of heaven, without doing the things that belong to the kingdom of heaven.' 'This is but a vain hope,' says Gregory Nyssen[85], 'bewitching the soul with false appearances and pretensions.' And as they thus exposed the groundless hopes of these men, so they as zealously demonstrated to them the vanity of their pretended fears. For though there was no second baptism for them that fell into sin after the first, yet it was not impossible for men to avoid falling into damnable sins after their first purgation; or, if they did so fall, yet if they were not sins unto death, they might obtain a second cleansing by pardon upon repentance. So that it was plain madness and folly to neglect baptism upon such uncertain fears, because that was to run a much more dangerous risk[86], whilst they sought to avoid a lesser inconvenience, which was attended

[83] Exhort. ad Bapt. Hom. 13. t. 1. p. 415. (ut supr. p. 166 a. n. 5.) *Τίς δέ σοι καὶ τὸν ὅρον τῆς ζωῆς ἔπηξε; τίς σοι τὴν προθεσμίαν τοῦ γήρως ὥρισε; τίς οὕτως ἀξιόπιστος παρά σοι τῶν μελλόντων ἐγγυητής; οὐχ ὁρᾶς νήπια ἁρπαζόμενα; τοὺς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ ἀπαγομένους; οὐκ ἔχει μίαν προθεσμίαν ὁ βίος. Τί ἀναμένεις πυρετοῦ σοι δῶρον γενέσθαι τὸ βάπτισμα, ὅτε οὐδὲ φθέγξασθαι δυνήσῃ τὰ σωτήρια ῥήματα, τάχα δὲ οὐδὲ ἀκοῦσαι καθαρῶς ἐπιτραπήσῃ, αὐτῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐνοικούσης τῆς νόσου; οὐ χεῖρας ἆραι εἰς οὐρανόν, οὐκ ἐπὶ πόδας διαναστῆναι, οὐ κλῖναι γόνυ εἰς τὴν προσκύνησιν, οὐ διδαχθῆναι χρησίμως, οὐχ ὁμολογῆσαι ἀσφαλῶς, οὐχὶ συνθέσθαι Θεῷ, οὐκ ἀποτάξασθαι τῷ ἐχθρῷ· τάχα δὲ, οὐδὲ συνετῶς ἐπακολουθῆσαι μυσταγωγούμενος, ἀμφίβολος ὢν τοῖς παροῦσιν, ἢ ἄρα ᾔσθου τῆς χάριτος, ἢ ἀναισθήτως ἔχεις τῶν γινομένων.*

[84] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 652 a.) *Αἰνίγματι λέγεις ὅμοιον, εἰ πεφωτισμένος ἐστὶ Θεῷ διὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπον ὁ ἀφώτιστος, ἢ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὁ ταύτης τυχεῖν σπουδάζων, δίχα τοῦ πράττειν τὰ τῆς βασιλείας.*

[85] De Bapt. Christi, t. 2. p. 216. (t. 2. p. 222 b. 4.) *Τὸ δὲ κενή τίς ἐστιν ἐλπὶς δόξῃ ψευδεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν γοητεύουσα.*

[86] [Vid. Chrysost. Hom. 20. in Hebr. p. 1884. (t. 12. p. 186 c.) where he refutes the Novatians and expostulates with such as delayed their baptism:—*Πάλιν ἐνταῦθα ἡμῖν ἐπιφύονται οἱ τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιροῦντες, καὶ ὅσοι πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα ὀκνοῦσιν ἐλθεῖν. κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

with much more safety, and had no such apprehended danger in it.

5. Some again there were, who deferred their baptism upon a principle of mere fancy and superstition, in reference to the time, or place, or ministers of baptism. Gregory Nazianzen[87] brings in some, making this excuse: 'I stay till Epiphany, the time when Christ was baptized, that I may be baptized with Christ; I rather choose Easter, that I may rise with Christ; I wait for Whitsuntide, that I may honour the descent of the Holy Ghost. And what then? In the mean time comes death suddenly, in a day thou didst not expect, and in an hour thou art not aware of.' Others had a superstitious fancy to be baptized in some certain place, as at Jerusalem, or in the river Jordan, and therefore they deferred their baptism, till they could have a convenience to come to the place intended. This seems tacitly to be reflected on by Tertullian[88], when he says, 'There is no difference between those whom John baptized in Jordan, and those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber:' and by St. Ambrose in his Discourse to the Catechumens[89], where, exhorting them to come with all possible speed to be baptized, he invites them 'to draw the blessing of consecration from the font of Jordan, and to drown their sins in that stream, where Christ's sacred person was baptized:' but then, that they might not mistake his meaning, he adds, 'that in order to their being baptized in the font of Jordan, it was not necessary they should go to the eastern country, or to the river in the land of Judæa: for wherever Christ was, there was Jordan: and the same consecration, which blessed the rivers of the East, sanctified also the rivers of the West.'

4. Superstitious fancies in reference to the time and ministers of baptism.

[87] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 654 a.) *Μένω τὰ Φῶτα, τὸ Πάσχα μοι τιμιώτερον, τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἐκδέξομαι, Χριστῷ συμφωτισθῆναι βέλτιον, Χριστῷ συναναστῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἀναστάσιμον ἡμέραν, τοῦ Πνεύματος τιμῆσαι τὴν Ἐπιφάνειαν· εἶτα τί; ἥξει τὸ τέλος ἐξαίφνης ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷς, καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκεις, κ. τ. λ.*

[88] De Bapt. c. 4. (p. 225 c.) . . . Nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Ioannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit.

[89] Serm. 41. t. 3. p. 268. [al. Serm. 38. de Grat. Bapt.] (t. 2. append. p. 441 c.) Debemus, fratres dilectissimi, vobis catechumenis loquor, gratiam baptismatis ejus omni festinatione suscipere, et de fonte Jordanis, quem ille benedixit, benedictionem consecrationis haurire; ut in eum gurgitem in quem [se] illius sanctitas mersit, nostra peccata mergantur. . . . Sed ut eodem fonte mergamur, non nobis orientalis petenda est regio, non fluvius terræ Judaicæ. Ubi [al. ubique] enim nunc Christus, ibi quoque Jordanes est. Eadem consecratio, quæ Orientis flumina benedixit, Occidentis fluenta sanctificat.

Eusebius[90] tells us, that Constantine had a design for many years to have been baptized in the river Jordan, after the example of Christ; and that perhaps might be the reason why he so long deferred his baptism: but God, who knew best what was fit for him, disappointed him in this design, and he was at last baptized at Nicomedia a little before his death. For as to that story, which is so pompously set forth by Baronius[91], concerning his being baptized by Pope Silvester at Rome, and cured of his leprosy, it is a mere fable, refuted by the testimony of all the Ancients, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, and the Council of Ariminum, who all speak of his baptism immediately before his death: and the best critics since Baronius, Valesius[92], Schelstrate[93], Lambecius[94], Papebrochius[95], and Pagi[96], agree in their verdict with the Ancients against the modern fiction. So that now it is agreed on all hands, that Constantine was one of those who deferred his baptism to the time of his death: and the most probable account, that can be given of this, is the fancy which he had entertained of being baptized in Jordan, which the providence of God never suffered him to put in execution.

[90] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 62. (v. 1. p. 662. 8.) ... *Ὥρα τοῦ σωτηρίου σφραγίσματος μετασχεῖν· ἐπὶ ῥείθρων Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ τοῦτ' ἐνενόουν ποτὲ ποιῆσαι, ἐφ' ὧν καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ εἰς ἡμέτερον τύπον, τοῦ λουτροῦ μετασχεῖν μνημονεύεται· Θεὸς δ' ἄρα τὸ συμφέρον εἰδὼς ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη τούτων ἡμᾶς ἀξιοῖ.*

[91] An. 324. n. 17. [al. 29.] (t. 3. p. 246 d.) In ejus vero Concilii [Romæ sub Silvestro celebrati] exordio hæc narrantur de causa cogendi ejusmodi episcoporum conventus: Eodem tempore, cum multi nobiles gauderent, quod Constantinus baptizatus a Silvestro, episcopo urbis Romæ, et mundatus fuisset a lepra; pro hoc beneficio, quod accepit a Domino nostro Iesu Christo per Silvestrum episcopum, cœpit integre prædicare Dominum Iesum Christum, et confiteri ejus beneficia, &c.

[92] Not. in Socrat. l. 1. c. 39. (v. 2. p. 75. n. 3.) ... Philostorgium hic sequi malim, qui Constantinum testamenti sui tabulas Eusebio Nicomediensi tradidisse scribit, a quo paulo antea fuerat baptizatus.

[93] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 2. c. 1. p. 7. (p. 43.) Favebat deinde Arianis Eusebius, idque non modo, cum Athanasii exsilium apud principem solicitarat, sed et cum ipsum Constantinum Imperatorem in fine vitæ baptizaverat. Ut enim alibi vidimus ex D. Hieronymi Chronico: *Constantinus, extremo vitæ suæ tempore ab Eusebio Nicomediensi episcopo baptizatus, in dogma Arianum declinat, &c.*

[94] Comment. de Bibliotheca Vindobonensi. t. 5. ap. Pagi, Crit. in Baron. an. 324. n. 4. [al. 5.] (t. 1. p. 397.) Antiqua est de tempore baptismi Constantini M. controversia, &c.

[95] Act. Sanct. Maii. in Vit. Constant. Maii 21. t. 5. p. 15. (Ed. Venet. t. 5. pp. 14, seqq. ap. c. 5.) *Controversia de Baptismo Constantini discussa.*

[96] Crit. in Baron. an. 324. n. 4. [al. 5.] (t. 1. p. 397.) Antiqua est, &c.

Another sort of fanciful men would not be baptized, till they could have one to minister baptism to them, who had some extraordinary qualifications. Gregory Nazianzen[97] takes notice of some such as these, and rebukes them after this manner: 'Say not thou, A bishop shall baptize me, and that a metropolitan, and also one of Jerusalem: for grace is not the gift of the place, but of the Spirit: say not, I will be baptized by one that is of noble birth, and that it will be a reproach to thy noble descent to be baptized by any other: say not, If I am baptized by a Presbyter, it shall be one that is unmarried, and one that is of the continent and angelic order, as if thy baptism were defiled by any other: make not thyself judge of the fitness or qualification of the preacher or baptizer, for there is another that judgeth of these things. Every one is qualified to thee for thy purgation, provided only he be one of those, that are allowed and not condemned, nor a foreigner, nor an enemy of the Church. Judge not thy judges, thou that hast need of healing. Tell me not of the dignity of thy purgators; make no difference among thy spiritual fathers; one may be better or more humble than another, but each of them is in an higher rank than thou.'

By all this it appears, that a superstitious distinction of times, and places, and persons, had an influence upon some, and was pleaded as a reason for deferring baptism.

6. Others pleaded for deferring their baptism, till they were thirty years old, from the example of Christ, because he was of that age when he was baptized. Which pretence is copiously refuted by Gregory Nazianzen[98], showing in answer

5. A pretence to follow the example of Christ.

[97] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 656 a.) Μὴ εἴπῃς, ἐπίσκοπος βαπτισάτω με, καὶ οὗτος μητροπολίτης, καὶ Ἱεροσολυμίτης· οὐ γὰρ τόπων ἡ χάρις, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος· καὶ οὗτος τῶν εὖ γεγονότων· δεινὸν γὰρ, εἰ τῷ βαπτιστῇ τὸ εὐγενές μου καθυβρισθήσεται· ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος τῶν ἀγάμων, καὶ οὗτος τῶν ἐγκρατῶν καὶ ἀγγελικῶν τὴν πολιτείαν· δεινὸν γὰρ, εἰ ἐν καιρῷ καθάρσεως ῥυπωθήσομαι. Μὴ ζήτει ἀξιοπιστίαν τοῦ κηρύσσοντος, μηδὲ τοῦ βαπτίζοντος· ἄλλος ὁ τούτων κριτὴς καὶ τῶν ἀφανεστέρων δοκιμαστής· ἐπειδὴ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰς πρόσωπον, Θεὸς δὲ εἰς καρδίαν. Σοὶ δὲ πᾶς ἀξιόπιστος εἰς τὴν κάθαρσιν· μόνον ἔστω τὶς τῶν ἐγκράτων, καὶ μὴ τῶν προδήλως κατεγνωσμένων, μηδὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀλλότριος. Μὴ κρῖνε τοὺς κριτὰς ὁ χρήζων τῆς ἰατρείας· μηδὲ φιλοκρίνει μοι τὰς ἀξίας τῶν σὲ καθαιρόντων· μηδὲ διακρίνου πρὸς τοὺς γεννήτορας. ἄλλος μὲν ἄλλου κρείττων ἢ ταπεινότερος, σοῦ δὲ πᾶς ὑψηλότερος.

[98] Ibid. (p. 658 c.) Ἀλλὰ Χριστός, φησι, τριακονταέτης βαπτίζεται, καὶ ταῦτα Θεὸς ὤν, καὶ σὺ κελεύεις ἐπισπεύδειν τὸ βάπτισμα; Θεὸν εἰπὼν λέλυκας τὸ ζητούμενον· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοκάθαρσις ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ἐδεῖτο καθάρ-

to it, 'that Christ, as God, was purity itself, and had no need of purgation, but what he did in that kind, was only for the sake of men; that there was no danger could befall him by delaying or protracting his baptism; that there were particular reasons for his doing so, which did not belong to other men; and that he did many things which we are not concerned to follow his example in; for all his actions were not designed to be copies and examples for our imitation.'

He that would see more of these pleas may consult the discourses of St. Basil, Nazianzen, and Nyssen, upon this subject; or Mr. Walker's Treatise of Infant-Baptism, in the preface to which he enumerates no less than nineteen such causes as these, which were the pretended occasions of men's deferring their baptism. Those I have already mentioned are sufficient to our present purpose, to show, that when men made great delays in this matter, they commonly did it against the rules and orders of the Church, and that the Ancients with great severity and sharpness always declaimed and inveighed against it as a dangerous and unchristian practice. Therefore, though there may be some particular instances of persons, who thus carelessly and wilfully, through ignorance or false conceits, neglected their own baptism, and perhaps the baptism of their children too; yet these men's actions are of no account to show us what were the standing measures and

σεως, ἀλλὰ σοὶ καθαίρεται· ὥσπερ καὶ σάρκα φορεῖ σοι ἄσαρκος ὤν· οὐδέ τις κίνδυνος ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ βάπτισμα παρατείνοντι· αὐτὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν ἦν ἑαυτῷ ταμίας, ὥσπερ τῆς γενέσεως· σοὶ δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ μικρῶν ὁ κίνδυνος, εἰ ἀπέλθοις τῇ φθορᾷ γεννηθεὶς μόνῃ, καὶ μὴ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἀμφιεσάμενος. Σκοπῶ δὲ κἀκεῖνο, ὅτι τῷ μὲν ἀναγκαῖος ἦν οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ βαπτίσματος, σοὶ δὲ οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος· ἀνεδείχθη μὲν γὰρ τριακοστὸν γεγονὼς ἔτος, οὐ πρότερον, τοῦ τε μὴ δοκεῖν ἐπιδεικτικὸς εἶναί τις· τῶν γὰρ ἀπειροκάλων τὸ πάθος, καὶ ὡς τελείαν βάσανον ἀρετῆς, καὶ τοῦ διδάσκειν καιρὸν ταύτης ἐχούσης τῆς ἡλικίας· ἐπειδὴ δὲ παθεῖν ἔδει τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σωτήριον πάθος, πάντα συνδραμεῖν ἔδει πρὸς τὸ πάθος, ὅσα τοῦ πάθους, τὴν ἀνάδειξιν, τὸ βάπτισμα, τὴν ἄνωθεν μαρτυρίαν, τὸ κήρυγμα, τὴν συνδρομὴν τοῦ πλήθους, τὰ θαύματα, καὶ ὥσπερ ἓν σῶμα γενέσθαι, μὴ διεσπασμένον, μηδὲ ἀπερρηγμένον τοῖς διαστήμασιν· ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος, ὁ τῶν συντρεχόντων σεισμὸς, οὕτω γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ καλεῖ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πλήθους, ἡ τῶν σημείων ἐπίδειξις, καὶ τὰ θαύματα τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ προσάγοντα· ἐκ δὲ τούτων ὁ φθόνος, ἐκ δὲ τούτου τὸ μῖσος· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μίσους τὸ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ τῆς προδοσίας, ἐκ τούτου δὲ ὁ σταυρὸς καὶ ὅσοις σεσώσμεθα· τὰ μὲν δὴ Χριστοῦ τοιαῦτα, καὶ οὕτως ἔχοντα, ὅσον ἡμῖν ἐφικτόν. Τάχα δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἄλλος εὑρεθείη λόγος τούτων ἀπορρητότερος. Σοὶ δὲ τίς ἀνάγκη τοῖς ὑπέρ σε ὑποδείγμασιν ἑπομένῳ, κακῶς βουλεύεσθαι, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τῶν τηνικαῦτα ἱστορουμένων ἑτέρως ἢ ὡς τὰ νῦν ἔχοντα φαίνεται, καὶ οὐ συμβαίνοντα τοῖς καιροῖς.

methods of proceeding in the Church, since they are manifest transgressions of her rule, and deviations from her ordinary practice. The Church had but two reasons at any time for deferring the baptism of adult persons year after year; the one was to give sufficient time to the catechumens to prepare them for baptism, and the other to reform their miscarriages, when they happened to turn lapsers or apostates before their baptism. Both these were grounded upon one and the same principle; which was, that men were obliged to give sufficient security and satisfaction to the Church, that they intended to live by the rules of the Gospel, before they were admitted to the mysteries of it: and the best security that could be given was from the experiment and trial beforehand, and therefore this discipline was used to make them give testimony of their intentions by a reasonable prorogation of their baptism.

The solemn times appointed for baptism by the Church were Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany.

7. Upon this account the Church appointed certain stated seasons and solemn times of baptism in ordinary cases; allowing her ministers still the liberty to anticipate these times, if either catechumens were very great proficients, or in danger of death by any sudden accident or distemper. The most celebrated time among these was Easter, and next to that, Pentecost or Whitsuntide, and Epiphany or the day on which Christ was supposed to be baptized. These three are plainly referred to by Gregory Nazianzen [99], where he brings in some giving this reason why they deferred their baptism: 'One said, he staid till the Epiphany;' (for the Ancients mean that by φῶτα and *lumina*, not Candlemas, as some mistake it, but Epiphany [1], the day on which Christ was baptized and manifested to the world;) 'another said, he had a greater respect for Easter; and a third, that he waited till the time of Pentecost:' which plainly implies, that these three festivals were then the most noted and solemn times of baptism. But Easter and Pentecost were the chief; for they are sometimes mentioned without the other, and sometimes with an express prohibition of it. St. Jerom speaks of the two former, as usual, but says nothing of the latter. He tells us [2], some

[99] Orat. 40. de Bapt. See s. 5. n. 84, preceding.

[1] [See b. 20. ch. 14. s. 7., where this is further explained. Ed.]

[2] In Zachar. 14, 8. (t. 6. p. 921 d.) Aquas viventes multi ad baptismum

referred that prophecy in Zachary to baptism, "Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; in summer and in winter shall it be:" (the Septuagint reads it, "in the summer and in the spring:") and this they applied to the two solemn times of baptism, Pentecost and Easter, one of which was in summer, and the other in the spring, when the living waters of baptism were distributed to all that thirsted after them. He mentions the same in his Epistle to Pammachius[2] against the errors of John of Jerusalem, where he speaks of forty, that were baptized at Bethlehem upon Pentecost, and others that offered themselves at Easter, but were rejected by that humoursome bishop, when they were ready for baptism. These two, and no other, are likewise spoken of by Tertullian. He says[3], 'Easter was appointed as the time of Christ's sufferings, into which we are baptized. And after that, Pentecost is a very large space of time set aside for that purpose. In which time Christ manifested his resurrection to his disciples, and the grace of the Holy Spirit was first given, and the angels predicted his second advent at his ascension.' Where it is very plain, that Tertullian, by 'the large space of Pentecost,' does not mean a particular day, but the whole fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, which in his time was one continued festival, as he tells us in other places[4]. And therefore though Vicecomes[5] reprehends Ludovicus Vives for as-

referunt, quæ in vere et in æstate, hoc est in Pascha et Pentecoste, sitientibus largiendæ sunt. [Vid. Septuagint. juxt. Ed. Lambert. Bos, Franequer. 1709.... Καὶ ἐν θέρει καὶ ἐν ἔαρι ἔσται οὕτως. Ed.]

[2] Vid. c. 17. [al. Lib. cont. Ioan. Hierosol. c. 42.] (t. 2. p. 452 b.)... Circa dies Pentecostes, quadraginta diversæ ætatis et sexus presbyteris tuis obtulimus baptizandos.—It. Præcepisti Bethleem presbyteris tuis, ne competentibus nostris in Pascha baptismum traderent.

[3] De Bapt. c. 19. (p. 232 a.) Diem baptismo solenniorem Pascha præstat, cum et passio Domini, in quam [al. qua] tingimur, adimpleta est... Exinde Pentecoste ordinandis lavacris latissimum spatium est, quo et Domini resurrectio inter discipulos frequentata est, et gratia Spiritus Sancti dedicata, &c.

[4] De Idolol. c. 14. (p. 94 b.)..... Ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est: tibi octavus quisque dies: excerpe singulas solennitates nationum, et in ordinem exsere [al. texe], Pentecosten implere non poterunt.—De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Die dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

[5] De Ritib. Bapt. l. 1. c. 25. (p. 150.) *Cur baptismus die Sabbati conferretur.* Neque vero difficilis est ratio ad explicandum, cur Sabbati die baptismus conferretur, si quis attentius totam rem consideret, et ipsius baptismi fructum et utilitatem intueatur. Etenim cum sepulturæ

serting this, as if he had no authority for it; yet Habertus[6] defends him out of this place of Tertullian; and other learned men[7] are of the same opinion.

Vicecomes thinks the time of baptizing at Easter was only one day, that is, the great Sabbath, or Saturday, when our Saviour lay in the grave. But this is also a mistake: for though this day was the most famous for baptizing catechumens and infants also, as we learn from Chrysostom[8], and the author of the Constitutions[9], yet the whole time of

Christi memoria Sabbato recolatur, eodem die baptismum dari ob id Patres instituerunt, ut Christiani, abjecta omni sorde peccati, ad novam vitam cum Christo sibi resurgendum esse intelligerent, &c.—Ibid. (p. 152.) Neque assentior Ludovico Vivi, qui, in grammaticæ ludo edoctus S. Augustini libros de Civitate Dei exponere, parum feliciter aggressus est. Is enim, Nota K. in c. 8. l. 22., a Paschate ad Pentecosten baptismum quotidie administrari solitum nullo auctore affirmat.

[6] Archierat. part. 8. observ. 4. (p. 134.) Atque ideo baptizandi jus episcopo reservandum existimo, iis præsertim temporibus, quibus baptizandis, citra necessitatis vim, certa tempora destinata sunt: Paschæ nimirum et Pentecostes, vel potius temporis totius Paschalis, *legitimus baptismi dies* vocatur a Concilio Matisconensi, ubi docet honoribus sacerdotalibus exclusos esse baptizatos alio die quam Paschali, in quo episcopum solum, aut neminem nisi episcopi arbitrio, baptizasse constat. Tempus Paschale dixi; immerito siquidem Josephus Vicecomes, in opere de Baptismi Ritibus, sugillat Ludovicum Vivem, quod dixerit moris fuisse, ut toto illo temporis decursu a Pascha ad Pentecosten baptizaretur: nullo, inquit, auctore, &c.

[7] Cave, Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 10. p. 307. (p. 148.) At first, all times were alike, and persons were baptized as opportunity and occasion served; but the discipline of the Church being a little settled, it began to be restrained to two solemn and stated times of the year, namely, Easter and Whitsuntide. At Easter, in memory of Christ's death and resurrection: correspondent unto which are the two parts of the Christian life represented and shadowed out in baptism, dying unto sin, and rising again unto newness of life; in order to which, the parties to be baptized were to prepare themselves by a strict observation of Lent, disposing and fitting themselves for baptism by fasting and prayer. .... At Whitsuntide, in memory of the Holy Ghost's being shed upon the Apostles; the same being, in some measure, represented and conveyed in baptism. When I say that these were the two fixed times of baptism, I do not strictly mean it of the precise days of Easter and Whitsuntide, but also of the whole intermediate space of fifty days that is between them, which was in a manner accounted festival, and baptism administered during the whole time, as I have formerly noted.

[8] Ep. 1. ad Innocent. (t. 3. p. 518 e.) Ἡμῶν αὐτὰ, καθάπερ ἔμπροσθεν εἶπον, προτεινόντων, ἀθρόον στρατιωτικὸν πλῆθος αὐτῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ, πρὸς ἑσπέραν λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπειγομένης, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπεισελθόντες, τὸν κλῆρον ἅπαντα τὸν σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς βίαν ἐξέβαλον, καὶ ὅπλοις τὸ βῆμα περιεστοίχιστο· καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα ἀποδυσάμεναι, κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν γυμναὶ ἔφυγον ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου τῆς χαλεπῆς ταύτης ἐφόδου.

[9] L. 5. c. 19. [Labb. c. 18.] (Cotel.

fifty days was set apart for this purpose, and accounted but as one solemn season for baptism. Which perhaps is the true reason, why some ancient canons allow no other time but that of Easter for baptism; including the whole fifty days from Easter till Pentecost, in the sense of Tertullian. Thus, in the second Council of Mascon [10], a decree was made, that whereas many Christians, not regarding the lawful time of baptism, were used to bring their children to be baptized upon any holy day or festival of a martyr, so that at Easter there were not above two or three to be baptized; they therefore enacted, that from thenceforward no one should be permitted so to do, excepting those whose childeren were in extremity of sickness and danger of death. A like decree was made in the Council of Auxerre [11] confining all children to the time of Easter, except in case of sickness, when they were allowed to have clinic baptism: and so Socrates [12] says, it was the custom in Thessaly to baptize only at Easter. All which must either be understood to include the fifty days of Pentecost, or else it must be said, these Churches had a peculiar custom differing from the rest of the world. For in other rules and canons, express mention is made of Easter and Pentecost, though other festivals are excluded. In the Council of Girone [13], in Spain, all catechumens are ordered to come only at Easter or Pente-

v. 1. p. 323.) Τῷ δὲ σαββάτῳ μέχρις ἀλεκτοροφωνίας παρατείνοντες, ἀπονηστίζεσθε ἐπιφωσκούσης μιᾶς σαββάτων, ἥτις ἐστὶ κυριακή, ἀπὸ ἑσπέρας ἕως ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἀγρυπνοῦντες, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συναθροιζόμενοι, γρηγορεῖτε, προσευχόμενοι καὶ δεόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν τῇ διανυκτερεύσει ὑμῶν, ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν Νόμον, τοὺς Προφήτας, τοὺς Ψαλμοὺς, μέχρις ἀλεκτρυόνων κραυγῆς, καὶ βαπτίσαντες ὑμῶν τοὺς κατηχουμένους, κ. τ. λ.

[10] C. 3. (t. 5. p. 981 e.) Relatione quorundam fratrum nostrorum comperimus, Christianos non observantes legitimum diem baptismi, pene per singulos dies ac natales martyrum, filios suos baptizare, ita ut vix duo vel tres reperiantur in sancto Pascha, qui per aquam et Spiritum Sanctum regenerentur. Idcirco censemus, ut ex hoc tempore nullus eorum permittatur talia perpetrare, præter illos, quos infirmitas nimia aut dies extremus compellit filiis suis baptismum percipere.

[11] C. 18. (ibid. p. 959 b.) Non licet absque Paschæ solennitate ullo tempore baptizare, nisi illos quibus mors vicina est, quos grabatarios dicunt, &c.

[12] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 297. 6.) Καὶ ἄλλο τὸ ἔθος ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ οἶδα γινόμενον· ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ Πάσχα μόνον βαπτίζουσι.

[13] C. 4. (t. 4. p. 1568 c.) De catechumenis baptizandis id statutum est, ut in Paschæ solennitate, vel Pentecostes, quanto majoris celebritatis celebritas major est, tanto magis ad baptizandum veniant. Cæteris autem solennitatibus infirmi tantummodo debeant baptizari, quibus quocunque tempore convenit baptismum non negari.

cost, because the greater the feast was, the greater ought the solemnity to be. But on all other festivals, none but sick people were to be baptized, who were not to be refused baptism at any time. Siricius, in his Epistle to Himerius[14], bishop of Tarraco in Spain, intimates indeed, that abundance of people presumed to take greater liberties to be baptized on the nativity of Christ, and the Epiphany, and the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs; but this was against the rule of the Roman Church, and all others, which reserved this privilege peculiarly to Easter, with its Pentecost or fifty days following, at which time baptism was generally administered to all that were qualified, but not at other times, except only to infants, and persons in a languishing condition and in danger of death. In the time of Pope Leo, the custom had prevailed in Sicily to baptize as many on the festival of Epiphany as at Easter or Pentecost: but he calls this[15] 'an unreasonable novelty, and a confusion of the mysteries of each time, to think that no difference was to be made between the day on which Christ was adored by the wise men, and that whereon he arose from the dead.' Therefore since these two, Easter and Pentecost, were the only lawful times of baptizing the elect catechumens in the church[16], he gives them an admonition, 'that they should

[14] C. 2. (CC. t. 2. p. 1018 b.) A nostris consacerdotibus .... non ratione auctoritatis alicujus, sed sola temeritate præsumitur, ut passim ac libere natalitiis Christi, seu apparitionis, nec non et apostolorum seu martyrum festivitatibus innumeræ, ut asseris, plebes baptismi mysterium consequantur, cum hoc sibi privilegium, et apud nos, et apud omnes ecclesias, dominicum specialiter cum Pentecoste sua Pascha defendat; quibus solis per annum diebus ad fidem confluentibus generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta, his duntaxat exceptis [al. electis], qui ante quadraginta vel eo amplius dies nomen dederint, et exorcismis, quotidianisque orationibus, atque jejuniis fuerint expiati, quatenus apostolica illa impleatur præceptio, ut *expurgato fermento veteri, nova incipiat esse conspersio.* Sicut sacram ergo Paschalem reverentiam in nullo dicimus esse minuendam, ita infantibus, qui nec dum loqui potuerint per ætatem, vel his, quibus in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit sacri unda baptismatis, omni volumus celeritate succurri, ne ad nostrarum perniciem tendat animarum, si, negato desiderantibus fonte salutari, exiens unusquisque de sæculo, et regnum perdat et vitam.

[15] Ep. 4. ad Episc. Sicul. c. 1. (CC. t. 3. p. 1297 e.) Miror vos tam irrationabilem novitatem usurpare potuisse, ut confuso temporis utriusque mysterio, nullam esse differentiam crederetis inter diem quo adoratus est Christus a Magis, et diem quo resurrexit a mortuis, &c.

[16] Ibid. c. 5. (p. 1300 b.) Unde quia manifestissime patet, hæc duo tempora, baptizandis in ecclesia electis esse legitima, monemus ut nullos alios dies huic observantiæ misceatis.

mingle no other days in the like observance.' He gives the same admonition to the bishops of Campania, Samnium, and Picenum, in another Epistle[17], against baptizing any, except in case of necessity, on the festivals of the Martyrs. And after him Gelasius[18] made another decree, directed to the bishops of Lucania, prohibiting baptism to be given at any other time, save Easter and Pentecost, except in case of dangerous sickness, when there might be reasonable fear of the party's dying without the remedy of salvation. So that in the Roman and Western Churches this was the general rule, to baptize none of the adult in ordinary cases, save only upon these two great festivals, though the practice in some places was a little dissonant to the injunction of the canons.

In the Eastern Churches, and in Afric, Epiphany seems also to have been regarded. For, besides what has been already noted out of Nazianzen, Valesius[19] has observed out of the

[17] Ep. 78. [al. 80.] c. 1. (ibid. p. 1373 b.) Magna indignatione commoveor, et multo dolore contristor, quod quosdam ex vobis comperi ita esse apostolicæ traditionis oblitos, et studio sui erroris intentos, ut præter Paschæ festum, cui sola Pentecostes solennitas comparatur, audeant sibimet, non aliqua humanæ infirmitatis necessitate cogente, sed sola indisciplinati arbitrii libertate, jus baptismatis vindicare, et in natalibus martyrum, quorum finis aliter honorandus est quam dies dominicæ passionis, regenerationis celebrare mysteria, ac sine ullis spiritualium eruditionibus præparationum, ita rudibus et imperitis tradere sacramentum, ut circa renovandos nihil doctrina ecclesiastica, nihil in exorcismis impositio manuum, nihil ipsa jejunia, quibus vetus homo destruitur, operentur, neque in tanto mysterio salutis humanæ ulla ejus diei habeatur exceptio, quo ipsum donum est conditum renascentibus. Admonemus igitur, et non sine periculo status eorum, qui hoc faciunt, protestamur, ut ab hac præsumptione cessetur, et summam hanc potentissimamque Dei gratiam non nisi in Paschali et Pentecostes die desiderantibus et credentibus conferatis: manente quolibet tempore gravium necessitatum ac periculorum consideratione, secundum quam oporteat subvenire, ne conditione mortali coarctata infirmitas necessaria liberatione fraudetur, cum servata ... duarum tantummodo festivitatum reverentia, propter multa pericula sit cavendum, ne cuiquam aut in desperata ægritudine, aut in hostilitatis incursu, aut in timore naufragii, per sacerdotem Domini regeneratio denegetur.

[18] Ep. 9. c. 12. (CC. t. 4. p. 1191 b.) Baptizandi sibi quispiam passim quocunque tempore nullam credat inesse fiduciam, præter Paschate festum et Pentecostes venerabile sacramentum, excepto duntaxat gravissimi languoris incursu, in quo verendum est, ne morbi crescente periculo, sine remedio salutari fortassis ægrotans exitio preventus abscedat.

[19] Not. in Theodor. l. 2. c. 27. (v. 3. p. 110. n. 2.) Τὴν τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος λειτουργίαν. Hunc locum de baptismi sacramento intellexerunt interpretes. Ego vero de festo Epiphaniorum die malim intelligere, quo Christus in Jordane est baptizatus. Hunc enim diem præcipuo honore colebant Hieroso-

ancient Ritual, called Typicum Sabæ, that on this day they were wont to baptize in the Church of Jerusalem. Johannes Moschus[20] mentions the same custom in other parts of the East; and Victor Uticensis[21] plainly intimates, that it was a solemn time of baptizing at Carthage, and in the African Churches. For though he does not name it Epiphany, yet we may easily collect it was either that day or Christ's nativity; for he says, it was but a little before the kalends of February, that fatal day, on which the African bishops were banished, and the church destroyed by the fury of the Arians, in the time of the Vandalic persecution.

In some places, the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs, and anniversary days of the dedication of churches prevailed also.

8. It was also customary, in some Churches, to make the anniversary festival of the dedication of the church a solemn time of baptizing. Sozomen[22] observes it to have been so at Jerusalem, from the time that Constantine built that famous church over our Saviour's grave at Mount Calvary, called *Anastasis*, or *The Church of the Resurrection.* For every year after that time the Church of Jerusalem held an anniversary festival of the dedication, which, to make the solemnity more august, lasted for eight days together, on which they held ecclesiastical meetings, and administered the sacrament of bap-

lymitani, eo quod apud ipsos Christus tinctus fuisset. Eoque die infantes baptizari apud illos solebant, ut legere nemini in Typico monasterii sancti Sabæ, ubi etiam officium illius diei refertur.

[20] Prat. Spirit. c. 214. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1170. ad calc.) Soruba vicus quidam est ad radices montis, in quo sita est Cœanensium civitas: In eo baptisterium est, quod in sanctis Epiphaniis sudat: qui sudor per tres horas continuis incrementis augetur, et post baptisma peractum decrescere incipit, et tribus aliis horis sensim deficit.

[21] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 2. Bibl. Magn. t. 7. p. 603. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 683 c. 2.) . . . Quia jam tempus urgebat, pergit cum eo, comitante officio clericorum, ad fontem. Ubi fixis genibus cum ingenti gemitu, pulsans singultibus cœlum, crispantem benedixit alveum fontis, et, cum completa surrexit oratione, ita cæco respondit: Jam tibi dixi, frater Felix, peccator homo ego sum, sed, qui te visitare dignatus est, præstet tibi secundum fidem tuam, et aperiat oculos tuos: simulque vexillo crucis consignante oculos ejus, statim cæcus visum, Domino reddente, recepit. Quem secum, quousque universi baptizarentur, ibi detinuit ob hoc, ne tanto miraculo populus excitatus virum contereret, qui receperat lumen. . . . . Appropinquabat jam futurus dies ille calumniosus Kalendarum Februarium, ab eodem statutus.

[22] L. 2. c. 26. (v. 2. p. 81. 30.) Ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ ἐτήσιον ταύτην ἑορτὴν λαμπρῶς μάλα ἄγει ἡ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησία· ὡς καὶ μυήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ τελεῖσθαι, καὶ ὀκτὼ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησιάζειν· συνιέναι τε πολλοὺς σχεδὸν ἐκ πάσης τῆς ὑφ' ἥλιον, οἱ καθ' ἱστορίαν τῶν ἱερῶν τόπων πάντοθεν συντρέχουσι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ταύτης τῆς πανηγύρεως.

tism; and many men came from all parts of the world to visit the sacred places upon this occasion. Valesius[23] takes some pains to prove out of several authors, the Chronicon Alexandrinum, Nicephorus, the Greek Menologium, and the Typicum Sabæ, that this was on the thirteenth of September; that no one might think it fell in with the festivals of Easter or Pentecost, the other solemn times of baptism. Whether the same custom prevailed in any other Churches, is not said; but it is not improbable that it might obtain, because Jerusalem was a leading pattern, and is sometimes styled the mother of all Churches.

The custom of baptizing on the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs seems to have prevailed in many of the French and Spanish Churches: but this was condemned and forbidden by many canons, and therefore cannot be spoken of as an authentic custom; because it was rather a transgression and encroachment upon the established rules of the Church, which in this case might be observed without any detriment, whilst a liberty was granted to baptize at any time upon sudden emergencies and extraordinary cases.

No such stated times in the Apostles' days.

9. Indeed in the first plantation of the Gospel there was no such obligation to observe any stated times of baptism, because the Apostles made no law about it. They themselves baptized indifferently at any time, as occasion required, and they left this circumstance wholly to the judgment and prudence of their successors in the Church, to act as reason and piety should direct them. This is very evident from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, and the subsequent history of the Church compared together. The author of the Comments on St. Paul's Epistles, under the name of St. Ambrose[24], has diligently noted

[23] Dissert. de Anastas. et Martyr. Hierosol. ad calc. Euseb. (v. 1. p. 786. 17.) . . Encænia ecclesiæ sanctæ resurrectionis 13. die Septembris quotannis celebrantur, ut legitur in Menologio Græcorum, et in Typico Sancti Sabæ 13. die Septembris, Τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ ἀναστάσεως.

[24] In Eph. 4. [v. 11, 12.] (t. 2. append. p. 241 d.) Primum enim omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant, quibuscunque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio. Nec enim Philippus tempus quæsivit, aut diem, quo eunuchum baptizaret; neque jejunium interposuit. Neque Paulus et Silas tempus distulerunt, quo optionem carceris baptizarent cum omnibus ejus. Neque Petrus diaconos habuit, aut diem quæsivit, quando Cornelium cum omni domo ejus baptizavit. . . . . Ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est ecclesia, conventicula

this difference in the Church's discipline, between the first and the following ages. 'At first,' says he, 'every one taught and baptized on all days and times, as occasion required. Philip stayed for no time, nor day, to baptize the eunuch, nor did he use any intermediate fast before it. Neither did Paul and Silas delay the time, when they baptized the keeper of the prison with all his house. Neither did Peter use deacons, nor stay for a solemn day, when he baptized Cornelius and his family. But when the Church had spread itself into all parts, then oratories were built, and church-officers were appointed, and several orders made about the administration of baptism: whence it was, that now neither deacons preached, nor any of the inferior clergy; nor did laymen baptize; nor was baptism administered at all times to believers, but only to those that were sick.'

That, which seems to have made the difference in this matter, was the difference in the zeal and readiness of the first converts, and those that came afterwards. For the Church found it necessary, in process of time, to proceed a little more slowly with the candidates of baptism, both in the instruction and trial of them, because of their dulness and negligence and frequent relapses. And by these means it came to pass, that in some populous Churches often vast multitudes were baptized together. As Palladius observes in the Life of St. Chrysostom[25], that at Constantinople three thousand persons were baptized at once upon one of these greater festivals. And this was the reason why deacons at Rome, who were not allowed to baptize upon any other occasion, no not even in times of sickness, were admitted to do it at Easter, because of the vast numbers of people that came then to be baptized, as I have had occasion to shew out of a canon of one of the Roman Councils in another Discourse[26].

constituta sunt, et rectores et cætera officia in ecclesia sunt ordinata..... Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant; neque quocunque die credentes tinguntur, nisi ægri.

[25] C. 9. (ad calc. Oper. Chrysost. t. 13. p. 34 e.) Τῇ ἐπαύριον οὖν ἐξελθὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς, τοῦ γυμνασθῆναι ἐν τῷ παρακειμένῳ πεδίῳ, εἶδεν τὸν ἄσπορον γῆν, τὴν περὶ τὸ Πέμπτον, λευχειμονοῦσαν· καὶ ἐκπλαγεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ τοῦ ἄνθους τῶν νεοφωτίστων, (ἦσαν γὰρ ἀμφὶ τοὺς τρισχιλίους,) ἤρετο παρὰ τῶν δορυφόρων, Τίς ἡ λογὰς τῶν ἐκεῖ συνηθροισμένων.

[26] Scholastic History of Lay-Baptism, part 1. ch. 1. s. 5. p. 19., according to the original edition of 1812, and now again reprinted in the ninth volume of this edition.

How far these rules were obligatory in succeeding ages.

10. But when these rules about stated times of baptism were in their strictest observation, there were still several cases wherein it was thought proper to dispense with them, and discharge men of their obligation. The case of sickness and extremity pleaded a just exemption, as we have seen before, in all the canons of the universal Church. And the promptness and proficiency of some catechumens above others, gave them an earlier title to baptism, if they desired it, without waiting for a more solemn season, especially in the Eastern Churches; as may be collected from the exhortations of Chrysostom and Basil, inviting such, as were duly prepared for baptism, to receive it the first opportunity, without staying for one of these greater festivals. 'You pretend to stay to the time of Lent,' says Chrysostom[27], 'but why so? Has that time any thing more than others? The Apostles received not this grace at Easter; but at another time. Neither was it the time of Easter when the three thousand and the five thousand were baptized, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles.' 'Other things,' says St. Basil[28], 'have their peculiar seasons: there is a time for sleep, and a time for watching; a time for war, and a time for peace: but the time of baptism is man's whole life; all times are seasonable to receive salvation thereby, whether day or night, every hour, every minute, every moment.' And Nazianzen[29], in answering that plea which men used for delay, that they stayed only till Easter, Pentecost, or Epiphany, plainly shews, that he rather thought 'men ought not to defer their baptism, when once they were qualified for it, lest death should come suddenly upon them in a day they did not expect it, and in an hour they were not aware of.' And in this respect

The place cited is C. Rom. c. 7. ap. Cotelerium, Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 3. c. 9. Paschæ tempore, &c. Ed.]

[27] Hom. 1. in Act. t. 4. p. 615. 33. Ed. Savil. (Ed. Bened. t. 9. p. 13 c.) Ἀλλὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἀναμένεις τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς; τίνος ἕνεκεν; μὴ γὰρ ἔχει τι πλέον ἐκεῖνος ὁ καιρός; οἱ γοῦν Ἀπόστολοι οὐκ ἐν τῷ Πάσχα κατηξιώθησαν τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑτέρῳ καιρῷ· καὶ οἱ τρισχίλιοι, καὶ οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι ὅτε ἐβαπτίσθησαν, Πάσχα οὐκ ἦν καιρός· καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος, καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος, καὶ ἕτεροι πλείονς· μὴ τοίνυν καιρὸν ἀναμένωμεν, μήποτε μέλλοντες καὶ ἀναβαλλόμενοι ἀπέλθωμεν κενοὶ καὶ ἔρημοι τοσούτων ἀγαθῶν.

[28] Hom. 13. Exhort. ad Bapt. t. 1. p. 409. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 158 d. n. 1.) Καιρὸς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπιτήδειος· ἴδιος ὕπνου, καὶ ἴδιος ἐγρηγόρσεως· ἴδιος πολέμου, καὶ ἴδιος εἰρήνης· καιρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἅπας ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος. . . . . Πᾶς μὲν οὖν χρόνος εὐκαιρίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος σωτηρίαν, κἂν νύκτα εἴπῃς, κἂν ἡμέραν, κἂν ὥραν, κἂν στιγμὴν χρόνου, κἂν τι βραχύτατον.

[29] Orat. 40. de Bapt. See before, s. 5. n. 87. p. 101.

it was true, what Tertullian said in the close of his Discourse upon this subject[30], 'that every day was the Lord's day, every hour, and every time was fit for baptism, if men were fit and prepared for it. One day might be more solemn than another, but the grace of baptism was the same at all times.'

So that these solemn times were set apart for prudent reasons by the Church, and for as prudent reasons they might be dispensed with, when either the necessities of a languishing distemper, or the zeal and activity of forward proficients made it advisable to anticipate the usual times of baptism, which, like all other parts of discipline, were designed for edification, and not for destruction.

Baptism not confined to any place in the apostolical ages.

11. The like observation may be made with respect to the place of baptism; for this varied also with the state and circumstances of the Church. In the apostolical age and some time after, before churches and baptisteries were generally erected, they baptized in any place where they had convenience, as John baptized in Jordan, and Philip baptized the eunuch in the wilderness, and Paul the jailor in his own house. So Tertullian[31] observes, 'that Peter baptized his converts in the Tiber at Rome, as John had done in Jordan, and that there was no difference whether a man was baptized in the sea, or in a lake, in a river, or in a fountain; for the same spirit sanctified the water in all places, and gave them the power of sanctification, when once they were consecrated by invocation and prayer.' After this manner the author of the Recognitions under the name of Clemens Romanus[32] represents Peter preaching to the people, and telling them, 'they might wash

[30] De Bapt. c. 19. (p. 232 b.) Cæterum omnis dies Domini est, omnis hora, omne tempus habile baptismo: si de solennitate interest, de gratia nihil refert.

[31] De Bapt. c. 4. (p. 223 c.).... Nulla distinctio est, mari quis an stagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur, nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Ioannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit..... Omnes aquæ de pristina originis prærogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificandi combibunt.

[32] L. 4. c. 32. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 541.) Ut in præsenti quidem tempore diluantur peccata vestra per aquam fontis, aut fluminis, aut etiam maris, invocato super vos trino Beatitudinis nomine.—Vid. Clementin. Hom. 9. n. 19. (Cotel. ibid. p. 684.) Ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι ἀενάῳ ποταμῷ, ἢ πηγῇ, ἐπεί γε κἂν θαλάσσῃ ἀπολουσάμενοι, ἐπὶ τῇ τρισμακαρίᾳ ἐπονομασίᾳ, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἐνδομυχοῦντα ὑμῖν πνεύματα ἀπελάσαι δυνήσεσθε, κ.τ.λ.

away their sins in the water of a river, or a fountain, or the sea, when they were baptized by invoking the name of the Blessed Trinity upon them.' And he describes[33] his own baptism, and some others, as given them by Peter in certain fountains in Syria by the sea shore. And so it seems to have continued to the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. For Tertullian[34] speaks of their 'going from the church to the water, and then making their renunciations there as they had done in the church before.' And Justin Martyr[35], describing the ceremony of the action, says, 'they brought the person who was to be baptized to a place where there was water, and there gave him the same regeneration which they had received before.'

In succeeding ages confined to the baptisteries of the church.

12. But in after ages baptisteries were built adjoining to the church, and then rules were made, that baptism should ordinarily be administered no where but in them. Justinian, in one of his Novels[36], refers to ancient laws, appointing that none of the sacred mysteries of the Church should be celebrated in private houses. Men might have private oratories for prayer in their own houses, but they were not to administer baptism or the eucharist in them, unless by a particular licence from the bishop of the place. Such baptisms are frequently condemned in the ancient Councils, under the name of *παραβαπτίσματα*, *baptisms in private conventicles.* As in the Council of Constantinople under Mennas[37] complaint is made against

[33] L. 6. c. 15. (ibid. p. 552.) In fontibus, qui contigui habentur mari, perennis aquæ mihi baptismum dedit. Cumque, pro regenerationis gratia divinitus mihi collata, feriati cum fratribus et laicis læti egissemus, Petrus eos, qui ad præcedendum fuerant ordinati, proficisci Antiochiam jubet, atque ibi tres alios exspectare menses: quibus profectis, ipse eos, qui fidem Domini plene receperant, deducens ad fontes, quos mari contiguos supra diximus, baptizavit.

[34] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) .... Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub Antistitis manu contestamur nos renunciare Diabolo, &c.

[35] Apol. 2. (p. 93 e.) Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται.

[36] Novel 58. (t. 5. p. 299.) Et priscis sancitum est legibus, nulli penitus esse licentiam domi quæ sanctissima sunt agere..... Sed si quidem domos ita simpliciter, &c. See b. 8. ch. 1. s. 4. v. 3. p. 7. n. 28.

[37] Act. 1. (ap. Crabb. t. 2. p. 70. col. dextr.)... Quanquam piissimus imperator noster mandaverit non reconventiculare, neque rebaptizare [leg. parabaptizare], Zoaras tamen tale præceptum despexit, et parabaptizavit in die Paschæ non paucos. [Ap. Labb. (t. 5. p. 26 d.) Καίπερ τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν βασιλέως κελεύσαντος, μήτε παρασυνάξαι, μήτε

Zoaras, the monk, that though the Emperor had forbidden all private baptisms by an edict, yet Zoaras, despising that order, had baptized many in a private house upon the Easter festival. The edict which that Council refers to was another Novel[38] of Justinian's, made against Severus and his accomplices, who after they were expelled the Church held conventicles in private houses, and received, and baptized, and gave the communion to all that came to them: which sort of parabaptizations are there condemned. So also in the Petition of the Monks presented to Mennas and the Council under him[39], these baptisms and communions in private houses are reckoned to be 'an erecting of strange altars and baptisteries in opposition to the true altar and baptistery or laver of the church;' under which name they are frequently condemned in the Acts of that Council[40]. And in the Council of Trullo[41] the order was again renewed, 'that no persons should receive baptism in oratories belonging to houses, but that they, who desire illumination, should go to the catholic (that is, the public) churches: and on pain of deposition to the clergyman, who was the administrator, and excommunication to the layman, who was the receiver.'

13. Now all these laws and rules were intended for the preservation of decency and good order in the Church, that baptism might be performed in the presence of the whole Church, whereof men were then made members, and all the congrega- Except in case of sickness, or with the bishop's licence to

παραβαπτίσαι, Ζωορᾶς ὅμως γοῦν τῆς τοιαύτης καταφρονήσας κελεύσεως κατεβάπτισεν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Πάσχα ἡμέρᾳ οὐκ ὀλίγους. Ed.]

[38] Novel. 42. c. 3. n. 1. (t. 5. p. 255.) .... Sed sancimus quemlibet talium silentium ducere, et non convocare aliquos ad se, neque accedentes recipere, aut parabaptizare audere, aut sacram communionem sordidare, &c.

[39] In act. 1. C. sub. Menna. (ap. Crabb. t. 2. p. 28. ad summ. col. sinistr.) .... Isti falsi sacerdotes et veri antichristi in domibus intrarunt, et aliena altaria erexerunt, et baptisteria ædificaverunt, in contrarium veri altaris et sancti lavacri. [Ap. Labb. (t. 5. p. 24 d.) *Ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἰδιωτικοῖς οἴκοις, καὶ ἐν προαστείοις θυσιαστήρια καὶ βαπτιστήρια ἀντεγείροντες τῷ ἀληθινῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ κολυμβήθρᾳ.* Ed.]

[40] Vid. Ep. Monachor. Syriæ Secundæ, in Act. 1. (ap. Crabb. ibid. pp. 66, 67.) [Ap. Labb. (ibid. p. 41 c.) .... *Καταπατοῦντος τὴν κρατοῦσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν εὐκοσμίαν τε καὶ κατάστασιν, ἐκ τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν παρασυνάξεων καὶ παραβαπτισμάτων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τολμωμένων.* Ed.]

[41] C. 59. (t. 6. p. 1170 a.) *Μηδαμῶς ἐν εὐκτηρίῳ οἴκῳ ἔνδον οἰκίας τυγχάνοντι βάπτισμα ἐπιτελείσθω· ἀλλ' οἱ μέλλοντες ἀξιοῦσθαι τοῦ ἀχράντου φωτίσματος ταῖς καθολικαῖς προσερχέσθωσαν ἐκκλησίαις, κἀκεῖσε τῆς δωρεᾶς ταύτης ἀπολαυέτωσαν· εἰ δέ τις ἁλῷ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν ὁρισθέντα μὴ φυλάττων, εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς εἴη, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκός, ἀφοριζέσθω.*

the contrary upon some special occasions.

tion might be spectators and witnesses of their admission. Upon which account it was improper to allow it to be done either in heretical conventicles or in private houses. Yet in cases of necessity, sickness, imprisonment, journeying, and the like, these rules could not bind; for they were only made for ordinary cases. Therefore we read of martyrs sometimes baptized in prison, and frequently of clinics, as they were called, who were baptized on a sick bed, and others baptized at sea, or in a journey, which were not interpreted transgressions of this rule, because the exigence and necessity of the case made them lawful. And sometimes baptism was allowed in private oratories by the bishop's licence, as both the law of Justinian and the Canons in some places had provided. For the Council of Agde[42] in France allows the eucharist to be celebrated in country chapels at all times by the bishop's leave, not excepting the greater festivals: and it is reasonable to suppose, that where the eucharist was allowed, there baptism might be administered also, though they were not properly parochial or baptismal churches. The Council of Eliberis[43] in Spain speaks of 'deacons presiding over a people, and baptizing in places, where there was neither bishop nor presbyter,' which we must reasonably suppose to have been country-villages at some distance from the mother-church, where yet for convenience baptism was allowed to be performed by the hands of a deacon. As St. Jerom[44] also testifies, who says, 'that in villages and castles, and places remote from the bishop's church, men were baptized both by presbyters and deacons.'

So that though the bishop's church was the ordinary place of baptism, as he himself was the chief minister of it, and the public baptistery was only at his church; yet upon proper reasons, by his authority and permission, baptism might be administered in other places, especially in those that were a sort of secondary churches; of which, and their several dis-

[42] C. 21. (t. 4. p. 1386 d.) Si quis etiam extra parochias, in quibus legitimus est ordinariusque conventus, oratorium in agro habuerit, reliquis festivitatibus ut ibi missas teneat propter fatigationem familiæ justa ordinatione permittimus, &c.

[43] C. 77. (t. 1. p. 978 e.) Si quis diaconus, regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit.

[44] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 9.] (t. 1. p. 181 e.).... In villulis et castellis et remotioribus locis, per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, &c.

tinctions from the *ecclesia matrix, the episcopal or principal church*, I have given a more particular account before[45] in the discourse of churches.

CHAP. VII.

Of the renunciations and professions made by all persons immediately before their baptism.

Three things required of all persons at their baptism. First, To renounce the Devil.

1. Having thus far conducted the catechumens to the place of baptism, that is, to the baptistery of the church, we are next to consider how the discipline of the Church proceeded with them immediately before their baptism. And here we are to observe, in the first place, that three things were now indispensably required of them at this season, that is, a formal and solemn renunciation of the Devil, a profession of faith made in the words of some received Creed, and a promise or engagement to live in obedience to Christ, or by the laws and rules of the Christian religion. For though these things were in some measure required of them before, during the time of their institution, yet now they were to make a more solemn and public profession of them before the congregation. Tertullian[46] seems to intimate this twofold profession when he says that, according to the discipline of the Church in his time, catechumens first made their renunciation of the Devil and his pomp and his angels in the church, when they received imposition of hands from the bishop in his prayers for them, and again when they came to the water to be baptized.

The form of this renunciation, and the import of it.

2. The form of this renunciation is more perfectly delivered by the author of the Constitutions, in these words[47]: 'I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him.' Others express it more concisely; some calling it 'the renunciation of the world,' as Cyprian[48], who sometimes joins the Devil and the world to-

[45] [See b. 8. ch. 1. s. 12. v. 3. p. 22. Ed.]

[46] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. See ch. 6. s. 11. n. 34, preceding.

[47] L. 7. c. 41. [Labb. c. 42.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 379.) Ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς λατρείαις αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς ἐφευρέσεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτόν.

[48] Ep. 7. [al. 13.] ad Rogatian. p. 37. (p. 190.) Sæculo renuntiaveramus, cum baptizati sumus.

gether, as where he asks one of the lapsers[48], who had gone to offer sacrifice at the Capitol, 'How a servant of God could stand there, and speak, and renounce Christ, who before had renounced the Devil and the world?' And so it is in St. Ambrose[49]: 'Thou wentest into the baptistery, consider what questions were asked thee, and what answers thou gavest to them. Thou didst renounce the Devil and his works, the world and its luxury and pleasures.' In like manner St. Jerom[50] joins the Devil and the world together: 'I renounce thee, Satan, and thy pomp, and thy vices, and thy world which lieth in iniquity.' Sometimes the games and shows, which were part of the Devil's pomp, were expressly mentioned in this form of renunciation, as it is in Salvian: 'I renounce the Devil, his pomps, his shows, and his works.' For he thus addresses himself to Christians, who still gave themselves liberty to be spectators at the Roman shows[51]: 'What is the first profession that Christians make at baptism? Is it not a protestation that they renounce the Devil, and his pomps, and his shows, and his works? Therefore these shows and pomps, even by our own profession, are the works of the Devil. How then, O Christian, canst thou, after baptism, follow those shows which thou confessest to be the work of the Devil?' Tertullian[52]

[48] De Lapsis, p. 125. (p. 89.) Stare illic potuit Dei servus, et loqui, et renuntiare Christo, qui jam Diabolo renuntiarat et sæculo?

[49] De Initiatis, [al. de Mysteriis] c. 2. (t. 2. p. 326 b.) Ingressus es regenerationis sacrarium, repete quid interrogatus sis, recognosce quid responderis. Renuntiasti Diabolo et operibus ejus, mundo et luxuriæ ejus ac voluptatibus.

[50] In Matth. 5, 26. (t. 7. p. 28 c.) Renuntio tibi, Diabole, et pompæ tuæ et vitiis tuis, et mundo tuo, qui in maligno positus est. [Conf. Chrysost. Hom. 47 in Julian. Mart. t. 1. p. 613. (t. 2. p. 679 a.) . . . . *Ὅταν καὶ ὁ Διάβολος μέσος ἐκείνοις παρῇ· καὶ γὰρ πάρεστιν ὑπὸ τῶν πορνικῶν ᾀσμάτων, ὑπὸ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ῥημάτων, ὑπὸ τῆς δαιμονικῆς πομπῆς καλούμενος. Σὺ δὲ ἀπετάξω πάσῃ σταύτῃ τῇ πομπῇ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λατρείᾳ συνετάξω. κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[51] De Gubernat. l. 6. n. 6. (p. 121.) Quæ est in baptismo salutari Christianorum prima confessio? Quæ scilicet, nisi ut renuntiare se Diabolo cum pompis ejus, atque spectaculis, et operibus protestentur? Ergo spectacula et pompæ, etiam juxta nostram professionem, opera sunt Diaboli. Quomodo, o Christiane, spectacula post baptismum sequeris, quæ opus esse Diaboli confiteris? Renuntiasti semel Diabolo et spectaculis ejus, ac per hoc necesse est, prudens et sciens, dum ad spectacula remeas, ad Diabolum te redire cognoscas. Utrique enim rei simul renuntiasti, et unum utrumque esse dixisti. Si ad unum reverteris, ad utrumque remeasti. — Vid. Cyril. Catech. [19.] Mystag. 1. n. 4. See n. 55, following.

[52] De Spectacul. c. 4. (p. 74 c.) Cum aquam ingressi Christianam fidem in legis suæ verba profitemur,

made use of the same argument before, to make Christians refrain from following the Roman theatres. But then he had also the charge of idolatry to throw into the scale against them. For, says he, 'What is the chief and principal thing to be understood by the Devil, his pomps, and his angels, but idolatry? Therefore if all the preparation and furniture of the shows be made up of idolatry, there can be no dispute but that the renunciation we make in baptism relates to those shows, and is a testimony against them.' He argues after the same manner[53] against all such secular offices and honours and employments as could not be held and discharged without partaking in some idolatrous rites and ceremonies; such as the offices of the flamens, and many others; in which the very wearing of a crown or garland, or exhibiting some of the public shows to the people, as by such an office they were obliged to do, made them guilty of idolatry, though they abstained from the grosser act of it, that of offering incense and sacrifice to the idols. And so the Council of Eliberis[54] determined, 'that such flamens as only exhibited the public shows to the people, (which in their language is called *munus dare*,) though they did not sacrifice to the idols, should be cast out of the Church all their lives, and only be admitted to communion at the hour of death.'

Whence it is plain, that, in the times of heathenism and idolatry, all such offices and employments as obliged men to exhibit those public games and shows to the people were supposed to be included in the renunciation of the pomps and works of the Devil, because of the idolatry that was interwoven with them. But in the time of Salvian all this idolatry

renuntiasse nos Diabolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus, ore nostro contestamur. Quid erit summum ac præcipuum, in quo Diabolus, et pompæ, et angeli ejus, censeantur, quam idololatria? .... Igitur si ex idololatria universam spectaculorum paraturam constare constiterit, indubitate præjudicatum erit, etiam ad spectacula pertinere renuntiationis nostræ testimonium in lavacro, quæ Diabolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus sint mancipata, scilicet per idololatriam.

[53] De Cor. Mil. c. 13. (p. 109 c.) Hæ erant enim pompæ Diaboli et angelorum ejus, officia sæculi, honores, solennitates, popularitates, falsa vota, humana servitia, laudes vanæ, gloriæ turpes: et in omnibus istis idololatria in solo quoque censu coronarum, quibus omnia ista redimita sunt.

[54] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 971 a.) Item flamines, qui non immolaverint, sed munus tantum dederint, eo quod se a funestis abstinuerunt sacrificiis, placuit in fine eis præstari communionem, acta tamen legitima pœnitentia.

was abolished, and these pomps and shows were no longer exhibited to the honour of idol-gods: yet they had still so much vanity, lewdness, and profaneness in them, that they were justly complained of as unchristian and diabolical, upon the account of their immorality, and therefore were reputed among those unlawful pomps which every Christian was supposed to renounce at his baptism. Cyril of Jerusalem[55], who wrote after idolatry was in a great measure destroyed, still continues the charge against them for their lewdness and cruelty, and reckons them among the pomps of the Devil, whilst he is explaining to his catechumens this part of their baptismal profession.

The antiquity of this renunciation. By some derived from apostolical practice.

3. The antiquity of this renunciation is evidenced from all the writers that have said any thing of baptism. And by some it is derived from apostolical institution and practice. For so they interpret that passage of St. Paul to Timothy, (1 Tim. 6, 12.) "Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." The authors of the Comments under the names of St. Ambrose and St. Jerom, supposed to be Hilary the Roman deacon and Pelagius, give this interpretation of the place: 'Thou hast confessed a good confession in baptism, by renouncing the world and its pomps, before many witnesses, before the priests and ministers, and the heavenly powers.' So Pelagius[56]. And Hilary[57] seems to say further, 'That this confession was also entered or enrolled in the monuments of the Church.' Others do not found it upon this or any other express text of Scrip-

[55] Catech. [19.] Mystag. 1. n. 4. [al. 6.] p. 280. (p. 308 b.) Εἶτα λέγεις, Καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πόμπῃ αὐτοῦ. Πομπὴ δὲ Διαβόλου ἐστὶ, θεατρομανίαι καὶ ἱπποδρομίαι, κυνηγεσία καὶ πᾶσα τοιαύτη ματαιότης, ἧς εὐχόμενος ἐλευθερωθῆναι ὁ ἅγιος τῷ Θεῷ λέγει· Ἀπόστρεψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν ματαιότητα. Μὴ περισπούδαστός σοι ἔστω ἡ θεατρομανία, ἔνθα τὰς ἀσελγείας τῶν μίμων ὄψῃ ὕβρεσι πεπραγμένας, καὶ πάσῃ ἀσχημοσύνῃ, ἐκτεθηλυσμένων τε ἀνδρῶν ἐμμανεῖς ὀρχήσεις· μήτε ἡ [μανία] τῶν τοὺς ἐν κυνηγίοις ἑαυτοὺς θηρίοις ἐκδιδόντων, ἵνα τὴν ἀθλίαν κολακεύσωσι γαστέρα; οἱ, ἵνα κοιλίαν τροφαῖς θεραπεύσωσιν, αὐτοὶ γαστρὸς ἀτιθάσσων ἀληθῶς τροφὴ γίνονται θηρίων· ἵνα δὲ δικαίως εἴπω, ὑπὲρ οἰκείου Θεοῦ, τῆς κοιλίας, τὴν ἑαυτῶν ζωὴν κατὰ κρημνῶν μονομαχοῦσι. Φεῦγε καὶ τὰς ἱπποδρομίας, τὸ ἐμμανὲς θέαμα, καὶ ψυχὰς ἐκτραχηλίζον. Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα πομπή ἐστι τοῦ Διαβόλου.

[56] In 1 Tim. 6, 12. (Oper. Hieron. t. 2. p. 154 c.) Confessus es bonam confessionem in baptismo, renuntiando sæculo et pompis ejus, coram multis testibus, coram sacerdotibus, vel ministris, virtutibusque cœlestibus.

[57] In 1 Tim. 6, 12. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 303 c.) Cujus confessio inter ipsa rudimenta fidei, teste interrogante et respondente, monimentis ecclesiasticis continetur.

ture, but yet derive it from ancient tradition. As Tertullian[58] and St. Basil; the former of which reckons it among many other ecclesiastical rites and usages, which are not expressly determined in Scripture, but yet proceeded from tradition, and are confirmed by custom. And St. Basil[59] ranks it among those mystical rites, which were received in the Church, not from any written word, but by private direction and tradition from the Apostles. The conjecture of those learned men[60] is

[58] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 101 d.) Hanc si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certe consuetudo corroboravit, quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit.

[59] De Spir. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 75 d. n. 66.) Τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κερυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως, διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ.

[60] Cave, Primitive Christianity, b. 1. ch. 10. (p. 152. last line.) Persons, having passed through the state of the catechumens, and being now ripe for baptism, made it their request to the bishop that they might be baptized; whereupon, at the solemn times, they were brought to the entrance of the baptistery, or font, and, standing with their faces towards the west (which, being directly opposite to the east, the place of light, did symbolically represent the prince of darkness, whom they were to renounce and defy), were commanded to stretch out their hand, as it were, in defiance of him: in this posture they were interrogated by the bishop concerning their breaking off all their former leagues and commerce with sin and the powers of hell; the bishop asking, Dost thou renounce the Devil, and all his works, powers, and service? to which the party answered, I do renounce them. Dost thou renounce the world, and all its pomps and pleasures? Answer, I do renounce them. This renunciation was made twice; once before the congregation (probably at their obtaining leave to be baptized), and presently after at the font, or place of baptism, as Tertullian witnesses. Next, they made an open confession of their faith; the bishop asking, Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.? In Jesus Christ, his only Son, who, &c.? Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, and in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, and life everlasting? To all which the person answered, I do believe. This form of interrogation seems to have been very ancient in the Church; and the Apostle is justly thought to refer to it when he styles baptism *the answer of a good conscience towards God;* which can reasonably refer to nothing so well as that common custom of answering in baptism.—Estius, in 1 Pet. 3, 21. (p. 1182.) Nobis verus ac germanus sensus esse videtur, quem tradit Beda, Apostolum loqui de interrogatione, quæ fit in cærimoniis baptismi; dum interrogatus, qui baptizari vult, an credat in Christum, et renuntiet Satanæ ac pompis ejus? bona conscientia, id est, serio, ex animo respondet, se credere et abrenuntiare. Quam interrogationem B. Petrus apposite vocat ἐπερώτημα, id est, *stipulationem;* quo inter duos, uno interrogante et altero respondente, contractus fieri solet.—Grotius, in loc. eund. (t. 2. v. 2. p. 1107. 9.) Ἐπερώτημα, *stipulatio,* est vox juris, ut videre est apud Theophilum titulo Institutionum, De Verborum Obligationibus et sequentibus, et apud Græcos Juris Romani Interpretes alios. In Glossario, ἐπερωτῶ, *stipulor.* Sed per μετωνυμίαν, *transnominationem,* ut in jure sæpe, nomine *stipulationis* comprehenditur et *responsio* sive *promissio;* nam et

not improbable, who think the form of renunciation, made by way of questions and answers, to have been so ancient in the Church as that the Apostle St. Peter may be justly thought to refer to it when he styles baptism "the answer of a good conscience towards God," which can reasonably refer to nothing so well as that common custom of answering in baptism, 'Dost thou renounce the Devil, &c?' 'I renounce him.' 'Dost thou believe in God, &c?' 'I believe.'

This renunciation made by persons standing with their face to the west. And the reason of that practice, with some other ceremonies.

4. It is further to be observed concerning this renunciation, that as soon as baptisteries were built, there was a particular place in them assigned peculiarly to this service. For they commonly had two distinct apartments, as has been shewed before[61] in the description of churches; first their *προαύλιον οἶκον*, their *porch* or *ante-room*, where the catechumens made their renunciations of Satan and confessions of faith; and then their *ἐσώτερον οἶκον*, their *inner room*, where the ceremony of baptism was performed. When the catechumens were brought into the former of these, they were placed with their faces to the west, and then commanded to renounce Satan with some gesture and rite expressing an indignation against him, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together; and sometimes by exsufflation and spitting at him, as if he were present: which were all of them so many indications of their abhorrence. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Mystical Catechisms to the Illuminated[62], thus describes this part of the action: 'Ye were first brought into the ante-room of the baptistery, and placed toward the west in a standing posture, and then commanded to renounce Satan, by stretching out your hands against him, as if he were present.' A little after he explains the meaning of their doing this with their face toward the west. 'The west,' says he[63], 'is the place of

ἐπερωτῶμαι significat *promitto, spondeo*, in eodem Glossario. In baptismo episcopus, vel alius quis ejus nomine, ita interrogabat, aut, quod idem est, stipulabatur, Ἀποτάσσῃ τῷ Σατανᾷ; *Abrenuntiasne Satanæ?* respondebat baptizandus, Ἀποτάσσομαι, *Abrenuntio*. Rursum interrogatus, Συντάσσῃ τῷ Χριστῷ; *Adhæresne Christo?* respondebat, Συντάσσομαι, *Adhæreo*. Hanc *sponsionem salutis* vocat Tertullianus de Baptismo.

[61] B. 8. ch. 7. s. 1. v. 3. p. 117.

[62] Il. Catech. [19.] Mystag. 1. n. 2. p. 278. (p. 306 d.) Εἰσήειτε πρῶτον εἰς τὸν προαύλιον τοῦ βαπτιστηρίου οἶκον, καὶ πρὸς τὰς δυσμὰς ἑστῶτες, ἠκούσατε καὶ προσετάττεσθε ἐκτείνειν τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ ὡς παρόντι ἀπετάττεσθε τῷ Σατανᾷ.

[63] Ibid. (d.) Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν ἵστασθε πρὸς δυσμάς· ἀναγκαῖον γάρ· ἐπειδὴ

darkness, and Satan is darkness, and his strength is in darkness. For this reason ye symbolically look toward the west, when ye renounce that prince of darkness and horror.' St. Jerom[64] plainly alludes to this custom, when he says, 'In our mysteries, (meaning the celebration of baptism,) we first renounce him, that is in the west, who dies to us with our sins: and then turning about to the east, we make a covenant with the Sun of Righteousness, and promise to be his servants.' In like manner St. Ambrose, discoursing to some newly baptized persons[65]: 'When you entered into the baptistery, and had viewed your adversary, whom you were to renounce, you then turned about to the east. For he that renounces the Devil is turned unto Christ.' Whence, as Gregory Nazianzen[66] observes, 'they did not only renounce the Devil in words, but in their very habit and gesture;' for they did it divested of their clothes, and with their bodies toward the west, and with hands stretched out against him; to this they added sometimes a collision, or striking of the hands together, and an exsufflation, or a spitting at their adversary, to express their abhorrence of him, as the author under the name of Dionysius[67] describes it.

Why this renunciation was made three times.

5. From whom we learn also, that this renunciation was repeated three times. For in another place[68] he thus describes the whole ceremony: 'The priest makes the person who is to be baptized to stand with his hands stretched out toward the

τοῦ φαινομένου σκότους τύπος αἱ δυσμαί· ἐκεῖνος δὲ σκότος τυγχάνων ἐν σκότῳ ἔχει καὶ τὸ κράτος· τούτου χάριν συμβολικῶς πρὸς δυσμὰς ἀποβλέποντες ἀποτάσσεσθε τῷ σκοτεινῷ ἐκείνῳ καὶ ζοφερῷ ἄρχοντι.

[64] In Amos, 6, 14. (t. 6. p. 322 d.) .... In mysteriis primum renuntiamus ei, qui in occidente est, nobisque moritur cum peccatis: et sic versi ad orientem, pactum inimus cum Sole Justitiæ, et ei servituros nos esse promittimus.

[65] De Initiatis, [al. De Mysteriis,] c. 2. (t. 2. p. 327 a. n. 7.) Ingressus es igitur ut adversarium tuum cerneres cui renuntiandum mox [al. in os] putaris, ad orientem converteris. Qui enim renuntiat Diabolo, ad Christum convertitur.

[66] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 671 a.) *Γνώσῃ καὶ τοῖς χρήμασι καὶ τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὡς ὅλην ἀποπέμπῃ τὴν ἀθεΐαν, οὕτως ὅλῃ θεότητι συντασσόμενος.*

[67] De Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 3. n. 5. p. 67. (t. 1. p. 172 a.).... *Γυμνὸν καὶ ἀνυπόδετον ἵστησι πρὸς δυσμὰς ἀφορῶντα, καὶ τῇ τῶν χεῖρων ἀπώσει τὰς τῆς ἀλαμποῦς κακίας ἀναινομένον κοινωνίας, κ. τ. λ.*

[68] Ibid. c. 2. part. 2. n. 6. p. 253. (p. 169 a.) *Εἶτα στήσας ἐπὶ δυσμαῖς προσέχοντα, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀπωθοῦντα πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπεστραμμένας χώραν, ἐμφυσήσαι μὲν αὐτῷ τρὶς διακελεύεται τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ προσέτι τὰ τῆς ἀποταγῆς ὁμολογῆσαι· καὶ τρὶς αὐτῷ τὴν ἀποταγὴν μαρτυρόμενος, ὁμολογήσαντα τρὶς τοῦτο, μετάγει πρὸς ἕω· καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέψαντα, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντα, κελεύει συντάξασθαι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ πάσαις ταῖς θεοπαραδότοις ἱερολογίαις.*

west, and striking them together; (the original is, τὰς χεῖρας ἀπωθοῦντα, which denotes *collision*, or *striking of the hands together by way of abhorrence*,) then he bids him ἐμφυσῆσαι τρὶς τῷ Σατανᾷ, *thrice exsufflate, or spit in defiance of Satan:* afterwards, thrice repeating the solemn words of renunciation, he bids him thrice renounce him in that form: then he turns him about to the east, and, with hands and eyes lift up to heaven, bids him συντάξασθαι τῷ Χριστῷ, *enter into covenant with Christ.*' Vicecomes[69] thinks this triple renunciation was made, either because there were three things, which men renounced in their baptism, the Devil, his pomps and the world; or to signify the three Persons of the Trinity, by whom they were adopted as sons upon their renouncing Satan; or because it was usual in civil adoptions and in the emancipations of slaves for the master to yield up his right by a triple renunciation, which he shews from Aulus Gellius and Sigonius. But as the Ancients are silent in this matter, I leave these reasons to the discretion of every judicious reader.

The second thing required of men at their baptism, was a vow or co-

6. The next thing required of men at their baptism was a vow or covenant of obedience to Christ, which the Greeks call συντάσσεσθαι Χριστῷ, *giving themselves up to the government and conduct of Christ.* This was always an indispensable part of their obligation, before they could be admitted to the cere-

[69] De Ritib. Bapt. l. 2. c. 20. p. 311. (pp. 310, 311.) Sed de eo etiam, quot vicibus renuntiationis verba proferrentur, nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur; nam inter sacros scriptores convenit, ter ea proferri solita esse: quod quidem non modo ex locis S. Gregorii M. et Ordinis Romani paullo ante citatis, sed etiam ex S. Dionysii Areopagitæ auctoritate colligitur, quum inquit, *Tum eum jubet tertio Satanam, ut ita dicam, insufflare.* Idemque ex illis S. Ambrosii verbis, Lib. 7. de Fide ad Grat., *Tertio repetita figura mysterii operationem Trinitatis expressit,* et Severi Alexandrini de Baptismo, *Profert ibi sacerdos pro baptizatis hanc abrenuntiationem tribus vicibus, sponsoribus ter, ut ipse, respondentibus, Abrenuntio Satanæ, ego N. qui baptizor,* licet cognoscere. Primus enim pro mysterii figura renuntiationem intelligit; alter ejusdem renuntiationis aperte videtur meminisse: ut dubitandum nullo modo sit, verba etiam illa Ambrosii, *operationem Trinitatis expressit,* ad ranem spectasse, cur ter a Satana conceptis verbis se desciscere profiterentur; ut nimirum tres hypostases divinas, quibus in filios adoptandi erant, ante oculos proponerent. Cui si quis adjiciat, detestationem tribus vicibus explicari solitam, quia tres erant, quorum fidem et amicitiam reprobabant; vel ut adoptionis civilis et emancipationis ritum exprimerent, quam triplici renuntiatione ejus, qui jure suo cedebat, peractum esse, Aulus Gellius [Noct. Attic. l. 5. c. 19.] et Sigonius [De Antiq. Jur. Civ. Roman. c. 10. Paris 1573. folio 47. vers.] testantur; diu me adversarium pertinacem haud habebit.

mony of regeneration. They first renounced the Devil, and then immediately promised to live in obedience to the laws of Christ.

venant of obedience to Christ.

Some indeed, in St. Austin's time, pleaded hard for an exemption in this particular. They were willing to make a profession of faith in Christ, but not of universal obedience; and yet would impudently pretend to demand baptism of the Church, notwithstanding their incorrigible temper. Against whom he wrote that excellent book, *De Fide et Operibus*, to shew the necessity of good works, as well as faith, to the being of a Christian; where he answers all the objections and arguments they pretended to bring from Scripture: for they pleaded Scripture for their practice. Amongst other things they urged that famous text of St. Paul, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." [1 Cor. 3, 11–15.] Upon which they made this perverse comment[70]; 'that they, who built upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, were such as added good works to their faith in Christ: but they who built wood, hay, stubble, were they that held the same faith in unrighteousness and a wicked life. And they imagined, that even these men might be so purged by certain punishments of fire, as to obtain salvation by virtue of the foundation, which they retained.' To which St. Austin replies[71], 'that if this was

[70] Vid. August. de Fid. et Oper. c. 15. t. 4. p. 30. (t. 6. p. 178 e.) Quod quidam ita intelligendum putant, ut illi videantur ædificare super hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, qui fidei, quæ in Christo est, bona opera adjiciunt: illi autem fœnum, ligna, stipulam, qui cum eandem fidem habeant, male operantur. Unde arbitrantur per quasdam pœnas ignis eos posse purgari ad salutem percipiendam merito fundamenti.

[71] Ibid. (e and f.) Hoc si ita est, fatemur istos laudabili caritate conari, ut omnes indiscrete admittantur ad baptismum, non solum adulteri et adulteræ, contra sententiam Domini falsas nuptias prætendentes, verum etiam publicæ meretrices in turpissima professione perseverantes, quas certe etiam nulla negligentissima ecclesia consuevit admittere, nisi ab illa primitus prostitutione liberatas.

true, it were a laudable charity indeed for them to endeavour that all men might indifferently be admitted to baptism, not only adulterers and adulteresses, who pretended false marriages contrary to the express command of Christ, but also public harlots continuing in the basest of all professions; which yet the most negligent Church on earth never pretended to admit to baptism, till they had first forsaken that vile prostitution.' They urged farther, 'that to deny wicked men the privilege of baptism, was to root out the tares before the time.' To which St. Austin replies[72], 'that this rejection of them from baptism was not rooting out the tares, but rather not sowing them, as the Devil did: they did not prohibit any that were willing to come to Christ, but only convinced them by their own confession, that they were unwilling to come to him.' And therefore though these men called it 'a novel doctrine and practice to reject harlots and stage-players, and all that made open profession of such abominable arts, from baptism,' yet he tells them, 'this was grounded upon the rules of ancient truth[73], which manifestly declared, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'

And that this was the ancient rule, by which the Church proceeded, is evident from all the writers that have spoken of baptism. Justin Martyr[74], who describes the ceremonies of baptism with the greatest simplicity, says it was only given to those, who to their confession of faith added also a promise or vow that they would live according to the rules of Christianity. And hence came that usual form of words in their profession, Συντάσσομαί σοι Χριστὲ, *I give myself up to thee, O Christ, to be governed by thy laws:* which immediately followed the ἀπόταξις, or *renunciation* of the Devil, whose service they for-

[72] Ibid. c. 17. (p. 182 f.) Quæ cum ita sint, quando tales ad baptismum non admittimus, non ante tempus zizania evellere conamur, sed nolumus insuper sicut Diabolus zizania seminare; nec ad Christum volentes venire prohibemus, sed eos ad Christum venire nolle, ipsa sua confessione [al. professione] convincimus; nec vetamus Christo credere, sed demonstramus eos nolle Christo credere, qui vel adulterium dicunt non esse, quod ille adulterium dicit esse; vel credunt adulteros ejus membra posse esse, quos per Apostolum dicit *regnum Dei non possidere.*

[73] Ibid. c. 18. (p. 184 c.) . . . . Nisi antiquum et robustum morem ecclesia retineret, ex illa scilicet liquidissima veritate venientem, qua certum habet, Quoniam qui talia agunt, regnum Dei non possidebunt.

[74] Apol. 2. See before, b. 10. ch. 2. s. 9. p. 461. n. 86.

sook to choose a new master, as we find it frequently in St. Chrysostom[75], St. Basil[76], St. Cyril of Alexandria[77], the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[78], and most of the Greek writers, whose words, as being but one and the same form, I think it needless to repeat upon this occasion.

The Latins commonly call it *promissum*, *pactum*, and *votum*, *a promise*, *a covenant*, and *vow*, which names they apply indifferently to all parts of the Christian engagement, as well the renunciation of the Devil, as the profession of faith and obedience to Christ, which do mutually suppose, and are virtually included in one another. For he that renounces the Devil and the world, does thereby profess himself a soldier and servant devoted to Christ. Therefore St. Ambrose, speaking of the renunciation[79], calls it 'a promise, a caution, an handwriting or bond, given to God, and registered in the court of Heaven: because this is a vow made before his ministers, and the angels, who are witnesses to it.' Upon which account he says in another place[80], 'it is recorded, not in the monuments of the dead, but in the book of the living.' St. Austin[81] calls it 'a profession made in the court of angels,' and 'the

[75] Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. p. 275. [juxt. Ed. Bened., Ad Illuminand. Catech. 2.] (t. 2. p. 238 a.) ...Ὁ δὲ μετανοῶν οὐκέτι τῶν αὐτῶν ἅπτεται πραγμάτων, ἐφ' οἷς μετενόησε· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ κελευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, ἵνα μηκέτι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπανέλθωμεν.—Id. Hom. 6. in Col. p. 1358. (t. 11. p. 369 c.) Ὁρᾶτε οὖν μὴ τούτῳ ἁλῶμεν, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν, Ἀποτάσσομεν τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ συντάσσομέν σοι, Χριστέ.

[76] Hom. 13. Exhort. ad Bapt. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 166 b. n. 5.) Οὐχὶ συνθέσθαι Θεῷ, οὐκ ἀποτάξασθαι τῷ ἐχθρῷ.

[77] In Joan. 11, 26. (t. 4. p. 683 e.) ...Ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐσχάτῃ νόσῳ κατειλημμένων, μελλόντων τε διὰ τοῦτο βαπτίζεσθαι, καὶ ἀποτάττονταί τινες καὶ συντάττονται, τὴν οἰκείαν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀγάπης, κιχρῶντες φωνὴν τοῖς νόσῳ πεπεδημένοις.

[78] L. 7. c. 41. [Labb. c. 42.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 379.)... Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀποταγὴν, συντασσόμενος λεγέτω, ὅτι καὶ συντάσσομαι τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ πιστεύω, καὶ βαπτίζομαι, κ. τ. λ.

[79] De Sacrament. l. 1. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 350 c. n. 5.) Quando te interrogavit, Abrenuntias Diabolo et operibus ejus, quid respondisti? Abrenuntio .... Memor esto sermonis tui, et nunquam tibi excidat tuæ series cautionis .... Ubi promiseris considera, vel quibus promiseris. Levitam vidisti, sed minister est Christi. Vidisti illum ante altaria ministrare: ergo chirographum tuum tenetur, non in terra, sed in cœlo.

[80] De Initiatis, [al. De Mysteriis,] c. 2. (ibid. p. 326 c. n. 5.) Tenetur vox tua, non in tumulo mortuorum, sed in libro viventium.

[81] De Symbol. l. 2. c. 1. t. 9. (t. 6. p. 556 c.) ... Professi estis renuntiare vos Diabolo, pompis, et angelis ejus. Videte dilectissimi, quia hanc professionem vestram in curiam profertis angelicam: nomina profitentium in libro excipiuntur vitæ, non a quolibet homine sed a superiore cœlitus potestate.

names of the professors are written in the book of life, not by any man, but by the heavenly powers.' St. Jerom[82] styles it 'a covenant made with the Sun of Righteousness, and a promise of obedience to Christ.' And he so speaks of this ceremony, as to show it to be a distinct act from the renunciation, though they both tended to the same end, because different rites were used in expressing them. For in renouncing the Devil they had their faces to the west, for symbolical reasons which we have heard before; but in making their covenant with Christ they turned about to the east, as an emblem of that light which they received from the Sun of Righteousness, by engaging themselves in his service.

This vow of obedience made by turning to the east: and why.

7. This custom of turning about to the east, when they made their profession of obedience to Christ, is also mentioned by St. Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the author under the name of Dionysius; for which they assign two reasons. First, Cyril[83] tells his disciples, 'that as soon as they had renounced the Devil, the paradise of God, which was planted in the east, and whence our first parent for his transgression was driven into banishment, was now laid open to them: and their turning about from the west to the east, which is the region of light, was a symbol of this.' For the same reason St. Basil[84], and some others of the Ancients, tell us 'they prayed towards the east, that they might have their faces towards paradise.' The other reason for turning to the east in baptism was because the east, or rising sun, was an emblem of the Sun of Righteousness, to whom they now turned from Satan. 'Thou art turned about to the east,' says St. Ambrose[85], 'for he that renounces the Devil, turns unto Christ.' Where he plainly intimates with St. Jerom, that turning to the east was a symbol of their aversion from Satan, and conversion

[82] In Amos, 6. 14. See s. 4. n. 64, preceding.

[83] Catech. [19.] Mystag. 1. n. 6. [al. 9.] (p. 309 c.) Ὅτε οὖν τῷ Σατανᾷ ἀποτάττῃ, πᾶσαν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντως διαθήκην λύσας, τὰς παλαιὰς πρὸς τὸν ᾅδην συνθήκας, ἀνοίγεταί σοι ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν ἐφύτευσε κατὰ ἀνατολὰς, ὅθεν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν ἐξόριστος γέγονεν ὁ ημέτερος προπάτωρ· καὶ τούτου σύμβολον τὸ στραφῆναί σε ἀπὸ δυσμῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν, τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ χωρίον.

[84] De Spir. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 75 e. n. 66.) Τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς τετράφθαι κατὰ τὴν προσευχὴν, ποῖον ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς γράμμα;

[85] De Initiatis, [al. De Mysteriis,] c. 2. (t. 2. p. 327 a. n. 7.) . . . . Ad orientem converteris. Qui enim renuntiat Diabolo, ad Christum convertitur.

unto Christ, that is, from darkness to light, from serving idols, to serve Him, who is the Sun of Righteousness and Fountain of Light.

The third thing required of the party to be baptized was a profession of faith in the usual words of the Creed.

8. Together with this profession of obedience there was also exacted a profession of faith of every person to be baptized. And this was always to be made in the same words of the Creed, that every Church used for the instruction of her catechumens. They were obliged to repeat it privately to the catechist, and then again publicly in the church, when they had given in their names to baptism; as I have shown before[86]. But besides this, they were also obliged to make a more solemn profession of it at the time of baptism, and give distinct answers to the several questions, as the minister propounded them, with relation to the several parts of the Creed, which contained the summary of Christian faith.

There were some indeed in St. Austin's time, who, as they were for excluding the profession of obedience out of the baptismal vow, so were they for curtailing the profession of faith, and reducing it to one single article, 'I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.' In favour of this, they pleaded[87] the example of Philip baptizing the eunuch upon this short confession [Acts, 8, 37], and that saying of St. Paul to the Corinthians, "I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." [1 Cor. 2, 2.] Yet they durst never proceed so far as to put their designs in practice; for they still continued to make interrogatories about the other articles, as the Church always did, concerning the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, the incarnation of Christ, his passion and death upon the cross, his burial and resurrection on the third day, his ascension and session on the right hand of the Father. All which were thought

[86] B. 10. ch. 2. s. 10. p. 462.

[87] Vid. August. de Fid. et Oper. c. 9. (t. 6. p. 172 b, c.) Spado, inquiunt, ille quem Philippus baptizavit, nihil plus dixit, quam, Credo Filium Dei esse Jesum Christum... ..Num ergo placet, ut hoc solum homines respondeant, et continuo baptizentur? Nihil de Spiritu Sancto, nihil de sancta ecclesia, nihil de remissione peccatorum, nihil de resurrectione mortuorum? ..... Si enim spado cum respondisset, Credo Filium Dei esse Jesum Christum, hoc ei sufficere visum est, ut continuo baptizatus abscederet: cur non id sequimur? Cur non imitamur atque auferimus cætera, quæ necesse habemus, etiam cum ad baptizandum temporis urget angustia, exprimere interrogando, ut baptizandus ad cuncta respondeat, etiamsi ea memoriæ mandare non valuit [al. vacavit]?

so necessary, that the Church never omitted them even in clinic baptism, when men were baptized upon a sick bed: for if they were able to speak, they answered for themselves, as St. Austin says, to every particular interrogation, though they were not able to commit them to memory; and if they were speechless, their sureties or sponsors answered for them as they did for children, as will be shown in the next chapter. So that, one way or the other, the whole Creed was repeated, and every individual article assented to by men at their baptism. And this was always the practice of the Church from the very days of the Apostles, and in their time also: for though no other article be mentioned in the baptism of the eunuch, but only his believing Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, yet, as St. Austin observes in the same place[88], 'the Scripture in saying, *Philip baptized him*, is to be understood as meaning that all things were fulfilled, which used to be observed in baptism, though for brevity's sake they be not mentioned.'

Indeed, in all the accounts we have of baptism in ancient writers, there is express mention of this profession, either to believe the doctrines of Christianity in general, as they are delivered in Scripture, or as they are briefly summed up in the articles of the Creed. Justin Martyr says,[89] 'before men were regenerated, they must both profess to believe the truth of those things which they had been taught, and also promise to live answerably to their knowledge.' Cyprian[90] particularly mentions the use of the Creed in baptism, and specifies several of the interrogatories that were made in reference to the particular articles of it; as, 'Whether they believed eternal life, and remission of sins in the holy Church?' which were always the concluding articles of the Creed. And in another place[91]

[88] De Fid. et Oper. c. 9. (t. 6. p. 172 e.)...In eo quod ait, *Baptizavit eum Philippus*, intelligi voluit impleta [esse] omnia, quæ licet taceantur in Scripturis, gratia brevitatis, tamen serie traditionis scimus implenda.

[89] Apol. 2. See before, b. 10. ch. 2. s. 9. p. 461. n. 86.

[90] Ep. 70. ad Episc. Numid. p. 190. (p. 301.) Sed et ipsa interrogatio, quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam? intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in ecclesia dari, &c.

[91] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magnum, p. 183. (p. 296.) Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat, eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica ecclesia teneat, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare; eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare eum

he speaks both of these, and the articles relating to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as interrogatories used in baptism both by the Catholic Church and the Novatians. For however they differed in the sense of some of the articles, yet they both agreed in the same form of interrogatories, and both baptized in the same Creed. Tertullian[92] also specifies the articles relating to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the Church, as part of the interrogatories of baptism. And Eusebius[93], reciting the words of the Creed of Cæsarea, says it was the Creed into which he was baptized. The same use was made of the Nicene Creed, as soon as it was composed, in most of the Eastern Churches. For they ordinarily baptized in the profession of that faith, as I have shown in the last Book[94].

It were easy here to subjoin many testimonies out of St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, Cyril of Alexandria and Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Nazianzen, Basil, Epiphanius, and Salvian, and the author of the Constitutions: but the matter is so incontestible, that the Ancients did never baptize into the profession of any single article, but into a complete and perfect Creed, that I think it needless to insist upon the proof of it, whilst there is not any pretence of an exception to be made against it in any public or private baptism whatsoever.

This confession made in the most solemn and public manner.

9. There were some circumstances and ceremonies of this confession, which, because they added something to the solemnity of the action, it will not be improper to mention. As, first, that it was usually done in public before many witnesses. Which was a circumstance grounded upon apostolical practice, and very rarely dispensed with. Primasius[95] deduces it from

potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discreparè;—sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem; neque eamdem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis in remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.

[92] De Bapt. c. 6. (p. 226 d.) Quum autem sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur ecclesiæ mentio: quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.

[93] Ep. ad Cæsariens. ap. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 23. 6.) Τὸ μὲν οὖν παρ' ἡμῶν γράμμα . . . τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον· καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, κ. τ. λ.

[94] B. 10. ch. 4. s. 17. p. 542.

[95] In 1 Tim. 6, 12. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 10. p. 240 g. 12.) *Confessus bonam confessionem*, in baptismo: *coram multis testibus*, coram sacerdotibus et ministris, atque virtutibus cœlestibus ac divinis.

the example of Timothy, who witnessed a good confession before many witnesses: [1 Tim. 6, 12.] which he interprets of his profession of faith made at baptism. Which is also the exposition given by Ephrem Syrus [96]. And Pope Leo [97] seems to refer to the same, when he exhorts men to 'stand firm in that faith which they confessed before many witnesses; that faith in which they were born again of water and the Holy Ghost, and received the unction of salvation, and the seal of eternal life.' It was usual at Rome, St. Austin tells us [98], 'to make this confession publicly in the church, in some eminent place appointed for the purpose, that they might be seen and heard by all the congregation. But sometimes, to favour the modesty of some very bashful persons, who could not speak without trembling in such an awful assembly, the presbyters received their confession in private: and this they offered to Victorinus, a famous rhetorician, upon his conversion; but he chose rather to make his confession in public, saying, There was no salvation in rhetoric, and yet he had always taught that in public: and therefore it would not become him, to be

[96] De Pœnitent. c. 5. [Juxt. Ed. Colon. 1547. (p. 91.) Requiretur a quolibet regium signum, ex qua die Catholicam et orthodoxam ecclesiam ac fidem nostram per baptisma suscepit: exigeturque a singulis fides in pace illibata, sigillumque infractum et tunica incoinquinata, secundum pulchram illam confessionem, quam coram multis testibus professi sunt, dicentes, 'Abrenuntio tibi, Satana, et omnibus operibus tuis.' *Grischov.*] [Ap. Ed. Assemann. Serm. in Secund. Advent. (t. 2. p. 216 f.) Τότε, φιλόχριστοι, ἐρευνᾶται ἑκάστου· ἡ σφραγὶς τοῦ χριστιανισμοῦ, ἣν ἔλαβεν ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ ἀπαιτεῖται ἕκαστος τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἀμίαντον, καὶ τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν ἄθραυστον, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα ἀμόλυντον, καὶ τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογιάν ἣν ὡμολόγησεν ἐπὶ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, λέγων, Ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ· κ.τ.λ.—See Interrogat. et Respons. (ibid. p. 378 d.), where nearly the same words occur.—Also (ibid. p. 379 a, seqq.) Ἡ ἀποταγὴ κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[97] Serm. 4. [al. 24. c. 6.] de Nativ. Dom. p. 17. (t. 1. p. 81.) Permanete stabiles in fide, quam confessi estis coram multis testibus, et in qua renati per aquam et Spiritum Sanctum accepistis chrisma salutis et signaculum vitæ æternæ.

[98] Confess. l. 8. c. 2. (t. 1. p. 146 f.) Denique ut ventum est ad horam profitendæ fidei, quæ verbis certis conceptis retentisque memoriter de loco eminentiore in conspectu populi fidelis Romæ reddi solet ab eis, qui accessuri sunt ad gratiam tuam, oblatum esse dicebat Victorino a presbyteris ut secretius redderet, sicut nonnullis, qui verecundia trepidaturi videbantur, offerri mos erat: illum autem maluisse salutem suam in conspectu sanctæ multitudinis profiteri. Non enim erat salus quam docebat in rhetorica, et tamen eam publice professus erat. Quanto minus ergo vereri debuit mansuetum gregem tuum, pronuntians verbum tuum, qui non verebatur in verbis suis turbas insanorum?

afraid of making a public confession of God's word before the meek flock of Christ, who had never been afraid to repeat his own words in the schools of the Heathen, who in comparison of Christians were only to be reputed madmen.'

10. Another circumstance, which added to the solemnity of the action, was the posture of the body, not only looking toward the east, but with hands and eyes lift up to heaven, as if they were immediately fixed on Christ, with whom they were now entering into covenant, as their new Lord sitting on the throne of his glory. For as they renounced the Devil with hands stretched out against him, or with collision, or striking them together in defiance of him; so on the contrary, they made their confession and covenant and addresses to Christ in the posture of petition, with hands lift up to the Sun of Righteousness, and ready to embrace him. So the author under the name of Dionysius [99] describes it, saying, 'The priest bids the catechumen, after he has renounced Satan, to turn about to the east and make his covenant with Christ, with hands and eyes lift up to heaven.' With hands and eyes lift up to heaven.

11. This confession also, for greater solemnity, is thought to have been repeated three times, as we have heard before that it was usual to do in the renunciation of Satan. Cyril of Alexandria [1] says, 'it was the custom of the Church to require a triple confession of Christ, of all those that proposed to love him and came to his holy baptism:' and this after the example of St. Peter, to whom Christ said three times, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" And Peter answered thrice, "Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." [John 21, 15—17.] St. Ambrose says [2], 'that in the celebration of baptism three interrogatories were made, and a triple answer was given to them; nor could any one be otherwise baptized. Whence also Peter was asked three times in the Gospel, whether he loved the Repeated three times.

[99] De Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 2. n. 6. See s. 5. n. 68, preceding.

[1] L. 12. in Ioan. 21, 15. (t. 4. p. 1119 d.) Τύπος δὲ πάλιν ταῖς μὲν ἐκκλησίαις ἐντεῦθεν εἰς τὸ χρῆναι τρίτον διερωτᾶν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ὁμολογίαν τοῖς ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἑλομένοις, διὰ τοῦ καὶ προσελθεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι.

[2] De Spir. Sanct. l. 2. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 654 b. n. 105.) Ideo in mysteriis interrogatio trina defertur, et confirmatio trina celebratur: nec potest quis nisi trina confessione purgari. Unde et ipse Petrus in Evangelio tertio interrogatur, utrum diligat Dominum, ut trina responsione vincula, quæ Dominum negando ligavit, absolveret. [al. quæ negando contraxerat, et quibus se ipse ligavit, absolverentur. Ed.]

Lord? that by answering thrice, he might loose those bonds, with which he had bound himself by denying his Lord.'

But I am not sure that this triple confession always means thrice repeating the whole Creed. For St. Ambrose in another place[3] makes this triple confession to be rather answering three times, 'I believe,' to the several parts of the Creed. 'Thou wast asked,' says he, 'Dost thou believe in God, the Father Almighty? And thou didst answer, I believe. Thou wast asked again, Dost thou believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and his cross? And thou didst answer a second time, I believe. Thou wast asked a third time, Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? And thy answer was, I believe. So thou wast thrice buried under water, that thy triple confession might absolve thee from the manifold offences of thy former life.' Where it is plain the triple confession means no more than answering thrice, 'I believe,' to the several parts of the Creed. But there might be different customs in different places; for St. Cyril seems to mean something more, when he makes these answers not only to be a confession of the three Persons of the Trinity, but a triple confession of Christ; which implies a repetition of the Creed three times over, if I rightly understand him.

And subscribed with their own hands in the books of the Church, as some think.

12. There was one circumstance more, which, if true, added great weight to the whole action: which was, that the party, after he had made his confession of faith, subscribed it also with his own hand. if he were able to do it, in the books or registers of the Church. I cannot positively say, that this was any certain or universal practice, but there seem to be some footsteps of it in some ancient records, and the allusions of writers to such a custom. Gregory Nazianzen[4] is thought to

[3] De Sacrament. l. 2. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 359 d. n. 20.) Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem? Dixisti, Credo, . . . Iterum interrogatus es, Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in crucem ejus? Dixisti, Credo, et mersisti. . . . Tertio interrogatus es, Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? Dixisti, Credo. Tertio mersisti, ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.

[4] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 670 a.) *Εἰ μὲν ἄλλως ἐγγέγραψαι, ἢ ὡς ἐμὸς ἀπαιτεῖ λόγος, δεῦρο καὶ μετεγγράφθητι· ἐγὼ τούτων οὐκ ἀφυὴς καλλιγράφος· γράφων ἃ γέγραμμαι, καὶ διδάσκων ἃ καὶ μεμάθηκα, καὶ τετήρηκα ἐξ ἀρχῆς, εἰς τήνδε τὴν πολιάν. Ἐμὸς ὁ κίνδυνος, ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ γέρας, τοῦ τῆς σῆς ψυχῆς οἰκονόμου, καὶ τελειοῦντός σε διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. Εἰ δὲ οὕτως ἔχεις, καὶ καλοῖς ἐνεσημάνθης τοῖς γράμμασι, φύλασσέ μοι τὰ γεγραμμένα, ἐν καιροῖς τρεπτοῖς ἄτρεπτος μένων, περὶ ἀτρέπτου πράγματος· μί-*

refer to it, when exhorting men to continue stedfast to the faith, which they professed at baptism, he says, 'If thou wast enrolled into any other faith than what I have expounded, come and be enrolled again: and then tell those that would draw thee away from it, What I have written I have written.' St. Ambrose seems also to allude to this, when he tells the initiated[5], 'that their hand-writing was recorded not only in earth, but in heaven, because it was taken both in the presence of men and angels.' And St. Austin says[6], 'the names of such as made their profession were written in the book of life, not only by men, but by the heavenly powers above.' Yet I confess St. Chrysostom has a passage, which seems to go contrary to all this: for, speaking of the difference between earthly masters buying slaves, and Christ taking us to be his servants, he reckons this among others[7], 'that Christ requires no witnesses, nor hand-writing of us, but only our bare word to say, I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy pomp!' Whence it must be concluded, either that this custom was not so universal as the rest, since St. Chrysostom knew nothing of it; or that the fore-cited evidences are not so cogent as at first sight they may seem to be. For St. Ambrose and St. Austin may be so interpreted, where they speak of being written in the book of life, as to be understood only in a figurative sense for having their names written in heaven. Yet Vicecomes[8] is

μησαι τὸν Πιλάτον ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον, κακῶς γράφοντα καλῶς γεγραμμένος· εἰπὲ τοῖς μεταπείθουσί σε, Ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.

[5] De Sacrament. l. 1. c. 2. See s. 6. p. 129. latter part of n. 79.—De Initiatis, c. 2. ibid. n. 80.

[6] De Symbol. ad Catechumen. l. 2. c. 1. (t. 6. p. 556 d.) . . . Nomina profitentium in libro excipiuntur vitæ non a quolibet homine, sed a superiore cœlitus potestate.

[7] Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 274. [juxt. Ed. Bened., Ad Illuminand. Cateches. 2.] (t. 2. p. 243 a.) *Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα οὐ μάρτυρας ἡμᾶς, οὐκ ἔγγραφα [ἡμᾶς] ἀπαιτεῖ· ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖται ψιλῇ τῇ φωνῇ, κἂν εἴπῃς ἀπὸ διανοίας, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, καὶ τῇ πομπῇ σου.*

[8] De Ritib. Bapt. l. 2. c. 27. (pp. 343, 344.) Postmodum professionem ita conceptam in tabulas referebant, suaque ipsi manu, si scribere nossent, vel, si nescirent, aliena, stabilem ratamque habebant: cujus sententiæ veritas a S. Dionysii auctoritate repetitur, apud quem sæpe hæc oratio usurpata est, ut professio in tabulis diceretur scripta.—Ibid. (p. 345.) Jam vero illa non longam orationem desiderant, quamobrem existimem fidei professioni subscriptionem addi consuevisse. Nam cum homines, propter justitiæ originalis, qua, tanquam fræno quodam, cupiditates regebantur, amissionem, ad scelera et flagitia facile labantur; et rursus cum ad conscientiæ fructum et officii religionem, tum etiam ad decus et gloriam, constantia promissorum et fide nihil in rebus humanis sit præstantius, priscis reipublicæ Christianæ rectoribus expedire vi-

very positive not only of this, but that men also set their seal to their subscription, and confirmed their profession with an oath. But I do not find any sufficient authority for this, and therefore will not any further insist upon it, which I had rather leave to the further disquisition of the critical and curious reader.

The use of all these ceremonies and engagements, to make men sensible of their obligations, and stedfast to their profession.

13. But by what has been said we may easily perceive, that the design of the Church in all these ceremonies, and the caution and deliberation used in the whole action, was only to make men truly sensible of the nature of the Christian religion, which admitted of no proselytes without these formal and solemn professions, and of their great obligations to continue stedfast in that faith and obedience to Christ, which they had so solemnly promised with their mouths, and subscribed with their own hands, not only before men, but in the presence of God and the holy angels. This was the greatest engage-

sum est, fidei professionem sua cujusque scriptione confirmari; ut si quis, veluti transfuga, a Christiana religione desciscere cogitasset, pudore datæ fidei et suæ confessionis testimonio impediretur. Præterea, ad rectam Christianæ reipublicæ gubernationem pertinebat, sicut cives olim, sic profitentium nomina literis consignari; ut omnium, qui sacrilegos ritus reliquerant, numerus intelligi posset. Demum, professionem, sacris monumentis traditam, annulo obsignabant: quod etsi difficile est probatu, propter tam pauca et tam rara testimonia scriptorum; tale tamen est, ut elaborandum sit, quo facilius probetur; nihil est enim omnium, quæ in hoc capite tractantur, quod illustrius curiosiusque dicatur. Igitur Tertullianus, Libr. de Baptism. c. 6., hanc consuetudinem ita declarat: *Ioannes antepræcursor Domini fuit, præparans vias ejus: ita et angelus, baptismi arbiter, superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit, ablutione delictorum, quam fides impetrat, obsignata.* Probare enim statuerat, fidei professionem deleri non posse, quod in ea sigillum annulo impressum esset. Verum clarius Libr. de Pudicitia, c. 9., ubi fidei professionem explicans, ait, *Annulum quoque accepit tunc primum, quo fidei pactionem interrogatus obsignat.* Potest etiam ad hanc consuetudinem referri, quod Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus scripsit Catech. I. Mystag., dum baptizandos ad memoriam eorum, quæ in catechesi audierant, excitaret: *Assistas catechesibus, et quæ in illis dicuntur memineris: dicitur enim non ideo, ut audias tantum, sed ut per fidem dicta obsignes.* Quo loco *obsignandi* verbum proprie, non metaphorice accipiendum est, cum rerum series ita declaret, et in Græco textu ἐπιφραγίσῃς τὰ λεγόμενα positum sit, nulla *per fidem* mentione facta. Nec tamen mihi sane quicquam occurrit, cur non Tertulliani sit et Cyrilli vera sententia: ut enim rationes nullæ hujus consuetudinis possent afferri, (vide quid hominibus tribuam,) ipsis auctoritatibus me frangerent: tot autem rationes afferri possunt, ut omnes enumerare pene sit infinitum. Illa tamen præcipua et maxime insignis, ut professionis scriptio fide non careret: quoniam publicis scripturis olim sigilla apponebantur, quod adhuc in pontificio vel episcopali diplomate, literis ordinum testimonialibus, et aliquot supremæ voluntatis tabulis, fieri solet.

ment imaginable upon them, and of force to influence their whole lives. To which purpose St. Chrysostom often proposes and insists upon it, to make men bear it perpetually in memory, and use it as their best armour and weapon against all temptations.

In his last Discourse to the people of Antioch, he expatiates upon this topic, inveighing first severely against all the shows of the Roman theatre, and circus, and observation of days, and presages, and omens, which he reckons among the pomps of Satan. To these he joins enchantments and ligatures: for some Christians made no scruple to hang golden medals of Alexander the Great about their head or feet to cure diseases. With whom he expostulates after this manner[9]: 'Are these our hopes and expectations, that after the cross and death of our Lord, we should put our trust for health in the image of an heathen king? Knowest thou not what wonders the cross hath done? How it hath destroyed death, extinguished sin, emptied hell, dissolved the power of the Devil? And is it not as fit to be relied on to cure a bodily disease? It hath given

[9] Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 275. (ubi supr. p. 243 e.) Αὗται αἱ ἐλπίδες ἡμῶν, εἰπέ μοι, ἵνα μετὰ σταυρὸν καὶ θάνατον Δεσποτικὸν, εἰς Ἕλληνος βασιλέως εἰκόνα τὰς ἐλπίδας τῆς σωτηρίας ἔχωμεν; οὐκ οἶδας πόσα κατώρθωσεν ὁ σταυρός; τὸν θάνατον κατέλυσε, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἔσβεσε, τὸν ᾅδην ἄχρηστον ἐποίησε, τοῦ Διαβόλου τὴν δύναμιν ἐξέλυσε, καὶ εἰς σώματος ὑγιείαν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀξιόπιστος; τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνέστησεν ἅπασαν, καὶ σὺ αὐτῷ οὐ θαρρεῖς; καὶ τίνος ἂν ἄξιος εἶης, εἰπέ μοι; οὐ περίαπτα δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπῳδὰς σαυτῷ περιάγεις, γραΐδια μεθύοντα καὶ παραπταίοντα εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν σου εἰσάγων, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ, οὐδὲ ἐρυθριᾷς, μετὰ τοσαύτην φιλοσοφίαν, πρὸς ταῦτα ἐπτοημένος; Καὶ τὸ χαλεπώτερον τῆς ἀπάτης· ὅταν γὰρ παραινῶμεν ταῦτα, καὶ ἀπάγωμεν, δοκοῦντες ἀπολογεῖσθαι, φασὶν, ὅτι Χριστιανή ἐστιν ἡ γυνὴ, ἡ ταῦτα ἐπᾴδουσα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον φθέγγεται, ἢ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄνομα. Διὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὖν αὐτὴν μάλιστα μισῶ καὶ ἀποστρέφομαι, ὅτι τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς ὕβριν κατακέχρηται, ὅτι λέγουσα Χριστιανὴ εἶναι, τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπιδείκνυται. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ δαίμονες τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄνομα ἐφθέγγοντο· ἀλλ' ἦσαν δαίμονες, καὶ οὕτως ἔλεγον πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν, Οἶδαμέν σε τίς εἶ, ὁ Ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅμως ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπήλασε. Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα παρακαλῶ, τῆς ἀπάτης καθαρεύειν ταύτης, καὶ, καθάπερ βακτηρίαν, ἔχειν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο· καὶ ὥσπερ χωρὶς ὑποδημάτων ἢ ἱματίων οὐκ ἂν ἔλοιτό τις ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καθεῖναι, οὕτω χωρὶς τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου μηδέποτε εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐμβάλῃς· ἀλλ' ὅταν μέλλῃς ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ πρόθυρα τοῦ πυλῶνος, τοῦτο φθέγξαι τὸ ῥῆμα πρότερον, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, καὶ τῇ πόμπῃ σου, καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου, καὶ συντάσσομαι σοι, Χριστέ· καὶ μηδέποτε χωρὶς τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης ἐξέλθῃς· τοῦτό σοι βακτηρία ἔσται, τοῦτο ὅπλον, τοῦτο πύργος ἄμαχος· μετὰ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου διατύπωσον· οὕτω γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἄνθρωπος ἀπαντῶν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Διάβολος βλάψαι τι δυνήσεται, μετὰ τούτων σε ὁρῶν τῶν ὅπλων πανταχοῦ φαινόμενον.

resurrection to the world, and canst not thou confide in it? But thou not only procurest ligatures, but also charms, bringing some old drunken staggering woman to thy house for this purpose, and payest reverence to these things, after thou hast been disciplined in the religion of Christ. Nay, when men are admonished of these things, they plead in excuse, that the old woman the enchanter is a Christian, and names nothing but the name of God. For which she is the more to be abhorred, because she abuses the name of God to so scandalous a practice, and whilst she calls herself a Christian does the works of the Heathen. The devils named the name of Christ, and yet were devils for all that, and were rebuked and ejected by our Saviour. Therefore I beseech you, keep yourselves pure from this deceit, and take this word as your staff and armour. As none of you will choose to walk abroad without his shoes or clothes, so without this word let none of you venture out in public, but when you go over the threshold of your gate, say first this word, I renounce thee, Satan, and thy pomp, and thy worship; and I make a covenant with thee, O Christ. Never go forth without this word, and it will be your staff, your armour, your invincible tower. And with this word, sign yourselves with the sign of the cross: and then not only man, but the Devil himself cannot hurt you, whilst he finds you appearing guarded with this armour.' Thus St. Chrysostom[10] exhorts men daily to remember their solemn profession of faith and baptismal vow, wherein they renounced Satan and embraced Christ, as the best preservative against sin and danger. To which both he[11] and Ephrem Syrus[12] add this momentous consideration, 'that an account of this vow will be required of men at the day of judgment; "for by thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned:" [Matth. 12, 37.] and Christ will say to every wilful

[10] [See the latter part of the preceding note. Ed.]

[11] Ibid. p. 274. (p. 243 a.) *Τοῦτο τοίνυν λέγωμεν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, ὡς ἐκεῖ μέλλοντες, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ταύτην, ἀπαιτεῖσθαι τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ φυλάξωμεν αὐτὴν, ἵνα σῶαν τὴν παρακαταθήκην ταύτην ἀποδῶμεν τότε.*

[12] De Abrenuntiat. Baptism. p. 150. (Ed. Colon. 1547. p. 92.) Hæc ipsa abrenuntiatio et pulchra confessio exigetur a quocunque Christiano in illa die, &c. [Ap. Ed. Assemann. Interrog. et Respons. (t. 2. p. 380a.) *Ταύτην οὖν τὴν ἀποταγὴν, κ.τ.λ.* Ed.] Hoc igitur dicamus, abrenuntio tibi, Satana: tanquam in illa die hujus vocis rationem reddituri, ut salvum tunc reddamus depositum.

transgressor of it, "Out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee, O thou wicked servant."' [Luke 19, 22.]

As nothing therefore could be more useful than this part of the Church's discipline, in requiring such professions and promises of every man before they entered the service of Christ; as it was usual for masters to do, before they bargained with slaves and took them into their family[13]: so nothing could be more material than the continued impressions of this vow upon men's minds, to keep them under a quick sense of their obligations, on which the whole conduct of their lives so much depended, and their eternal interest at the day of judgment.

Whether public and particular confession of sins was required of men at their baptism.

14. There is one thing more remains to be inquired into under this head, that is, Whether any public or particular confession of sins was required of men at their baptism, besides what was implied in the general renunciation of Satan and all his works and service? Now this is plainly resolved by St. Chrysostom in the negative. For, discoursing[14] of the difference between God's choosing his servants, and the choice which earthly princes and masters make of their soldiers and slaves, he makes the difference chiefly to consist in this: 'That before men were allowed to enter the lists in any of the famous exercises of the theatre, a public crier must first lead them about

[13] Vid. Chrysost. ubi supr. p. 273. (t. 2. p. 242 d.) Καθάπερ ἡμεῖς, οἰκέτας ἀγοράζοντες, αὐτοὺς τοὺς πωλουμένους πρότερον ἐρωτῶμεν, εἰ βούλονται ἡμῖν δουλεῦσαι, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ποιεῖ, κ. τ. λ.

[14] Ibid. p. 270. (p. 239 e.) Οἱ γὰρ μέλλοντες εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἔλκεσθαι ἐκεῖνο, οὐ πρότερον καθίασιν εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἕως ἂν αὐτοὺς ὁ κήρυξ λαβὼν ὑπὸ τοῖς ἁπάντων ὀφθαλμοῖς περιάγῃ, βοῶν καὶ λέγων, Μή τις τούτου κατηγορεῖ; καί τοι γε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ ψυχῆς ἀλλὰ σωμάτων τὰ παλαίσματα'.. ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἅπαν τοὐναντίον, οὐκ ἐν χειρῶν συμπλοκαῖς ὄντων ἡμῖν τῶν παλαισμάτων, ἀλλ' ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ψυχῆς καὶ ἀρετῇ διανοίας· τοὐναντίον ὁ ἀγωνοθέτης ποιεῖ· οὐ γὰρ λαβὼν αὐτὸν περιάγει, καὶ λέγει, Μή τις τούτου κατηγορεῖ; ἀλλὰ βοᾷ, Κἂν ἄνθρωποι πάντες, κἂν δαίμονες μετὰ τοῦ Διαβόλου συστάντες αὐτοῦ κατηγορῶσι τὰ ἔσχατα καὶ ἀπόρρητα δεινά, οὐκ ἐκβάλλω, οὐδὲ βδελύσσομαι· ἀλλὰ τῶν κατηγόρων αὐτὸν ἀπαλλάξας, καὶ τῆς πονηρίας ἐλευθερώσας, οὕτως ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἄγω.... Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ θαυμαστὸν, ὅτι ἀφίησιν ἡμῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὰ οὐδὲ ἐκκαλύπτει, οὐδὲ ποιεῖ φανερὰ καὶ δῆλα, οὐδὲ ἀναγκάζει παρελθόντας εἰς μέσον ἐξειπεῖν τὰ πεπλημμελημένα, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ μόνῳ ἀπολογήσασθαι κελεύει, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξομολογήσασθαι. Καί τοιγε ἐκ τῶν ἔξωθεν δικαστῶν εἴ τις εἴπῃ τινι τῶν ἀλόντων ληστῶν ἢ τυμβωρύχων, εἰπεῖν τὰ πεπλημμελημένα, καὶ ἀφεθῆναι τῆς κολάσεως, πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ ἂν κατεδέξαντο τοῦτο, τῇ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐπιθυμίᾳ, τῆς αἰσχύνης καταφρονοῦντες· ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφίησι τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, καὶ οὐκ ἀναγκάζει παρόντων τινῶν αὐτὰ ἐκπομπεύειν, ἀλλ' ἓν μόνον ζητεῖ, ὅπως αὐτὸς, ὁ τῆς ἀφέσεως ἀπολαύων, μάθοι τῆς δωρεᾶς τὸ μέγεθος.

by the hand before all, and cry out, saying, Does any one accuse this man? though there the engagement was only of the body and not of the soul. But in God's choice of us it is quite otherwise: for though our engagement depends not upon strength of arms, but on the philosophy and virtue of our souls, yet the ruler and governor thereof acts quite contrary. He does not take a man, and lead him about, and say, Does any one accuse him? But he cries out, Though all men and devils should rise up against him, and accuse him of secret and horrible crimes, I do not reject, I do not abhor him; but I deliver him from his accuser, and absolve him from his iniquity, and so I lead him to the combat. Nor is this the only admirable thing, that he forgives our sins, but that he does not reveal nor disclose them; he neither makes open proclamation of them, nor compels those that come to him to publish their own offences, but requires them to give account, and confess their sins to him alone. He does not, like earthly judges, oblige criminals to make a public confession before all men in hopes of pardon, but he forgives sins upon our private testimony without any other witnesses.'

This is undeniable evidence that no public confession was required of men for their private offences, when they came to baptism: and therefore, when Gregory Nazianzen[15] speaks of confession of sins made at baptism, he is to be understood, either of a general confession, or of such a particular confession as men voluntarily imposed upon themselves, to testify more eminently the sincerity of their repentance; which some think was done at John's baptism, [Matth. 3, 6,] when the people "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins;" and in the baptism of those mentioned in the Acts, [19, 18,] where it is said that "many who believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds;" though this was not imposed upon men by any necessary law or rule of the Church. In case of public scandalous crimes, they were obliged particularly to promise and vow the forsaking of them: but for private crimes,

[15] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 657 a.) Μὴ ἀπαξιώσῃς ἐξαγορεῦσαί σου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν· εἰδὼς ὅπως Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτισεν, ἵνα τὴν ἐκεῖθεν αἰσχύνην τῇ ἐνταῦθα φύγῃς· ἐπειδὰν μέρος καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἐκεῖσε κολάσεως· καὶ δείξῃς ὅτι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὄντως μεμίσηκας, παραδειγματίσας αὐτὴν, καὶ θριαμβεύσας, ὡς ἀξίαν ὕβρεως.

no particular confession was required to be made, save only to God, with a general renunciation of all sin, in which every private crime was supposed to be included[16].

CHAP. VIII.

Of the use of sponsors or sureties in baptism.

1. Next to the conditions and promises required of men in their baptism, we must examine *the office and business of sponsors or sureties*, who had always some concern in these obligations. And here it is first to be observed, that there were three sorts of sponsors made use of in the Primitive Church. 1. For children, who could not renounce, or profess, or answer for themselves. 2. For such adult persons, as by reason of sickness or infirmity were in the same condition as children, incapacitated to answer for themselves. 3. For all adult persons in general. For the Church required sponsors also for those who were otherwise qualified to make their own responses.

Three sorts of sponsors in the Primitive Church. First, for children.

Now the office of sponsors was diversified a little in its nature, according to these distinctions. They, who were sureties or sponsors for children, were obliged first to answer in their names to all the interrogatories that were usually put in baptism, and then to be guardians of their Christian education. Some will also needs have it that they were obliged to give them a perfect maintenance, and take them, as it were, for their own children by adoption, in case their parents failed, and left them destitute in their minority.

2. But this I take to be a mistake. For whoever were sponsors for children, if ever they became destitute, the burden devolved upon the Church in general, and not upon any others. Which will be evidenced by two considerations.

Parents commonly sponsors for their own children.

First, parents were commonly sponsors for their own children: and in that case there can be no dispute where the obligation of maintenance lay, so long as they were alive. For they were obliged to maintain their own children by a natural law, not because they were sponsors, but because they were parents to

[16] Vid. August. Serm. 116. de Tempore. [al. Serm. 267. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 440 a. n. 2.) Ideo rogo vos et commemoro, &c.

them. It was not indeed absolutely necessary that parents should be sponsors for their own children, though some in St. Austin's days were inclined to think so, which he reckons an error, and shows[17] that in many cases there was a necessity it should be otherwise. But yet in most cases the parents were sponsors for their own children, as appears from St. Austin[18], who speaks of parents in all ordinary cases offering their own children to baptism, and making the proper responses for them: and the extraordinary cases, in which they were presented by others, were commonly such cases where the parents could not or would not do that kind office for them: as when slaves were presented to baptism by their masters[19], or children, whose parents were dead, were brought by the charity of any who would show mercy on them; or children exposed by their parents, which were sometimes taken up by the holy virgins of the Church, and by them presented unto baptism.

These are the only cases mentioned by St. Austin, in which children seem to have had other sponsors, and not their parents. Which makes it probable, that in all ordinary cases parents were sureties for their own children. Which may be collected also from the author of the Hypognostics, under the name of St. Austin[20], who speaks of 'infants being presented to baptism by the hands of their parents, and some of them dying in their arms before the priest could baptize them.' Whilst parents therefore were sureties for their own children, they were obliged to maintain them; but this not by the law of sureties,

[17] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 266 c.) Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatus vinculum, ex Adam tractum, aliter non posse disrumpi, nisi parvuli ad percipiendam Christi gratiam a parentibus offerantur.

[18] Ibid. (p. 266 f.) .... Quid est illud, quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, parentes pro eis tanquam fidedictores respondent, &c.

[19] Ibid. (p. 266 d.)...Cum videas multos non offerri a parentibus, sed etiam a quibuslibet extraneis, sicut a Dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam, mortuis parentibus suis, parvuli baptizantur, ab eis oblati, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam, quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet, nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum.

[20] Cont. Pelag. l. 6. c. 7. t. 7. p. 633. (t. 10. append. part. 1. p. 48 c.) Novimus etiam parvulos, quibus usus liberi arbitrii non est, ut de bonis aut malis eorum meritis judicemus, parentum manibus ad gratiam sacri baptismatis deportatos: et cum in uno eorum per manus sacerdotis mysterium fidei adimpleretur, aliquoties alterum in parentum manibus factum exanimem, fraudatum gratia Salvatoris.

but by the law of nature; and if they failed, this duty devolved upon the whole Church.

Other sureties not bound to maintain the children for whom they were sponsors.

3. Secondly, in other cases, where strangers became sureties for children, the burden of maintenance did never devolve upon them by any law of suretyship, except they were obliged by some antecedent law to take care of them. In case a master was sponsor for his slave, he was obliged to maintain him, because he was antecedently in the nature of a father to him: and this obligation arose, not from his suretyship, but from his being his master. But in other cases it was not so. For sometimes children that were exposed, were taken up and presented to baptism by mere strangers; and in that case the burden of maintenance fell upon the Church, and not upon the sponsors. And in some cases, as St. Austin[21] informs us, such children were presented unto baptism by the sacred virgins of the Church, who had no other maintenance but what they themselves received from the Church: and in that case it is evident the children's maintenance must be derived from the same fountain as the virgins' was, that is, from the public stock of the Church. So that in all cases the Church was charged with this care, and not the sponsors, except there was some antecedent obligation. And there was good reason for this; for, as St. Austin[22] observes, 'children were presented to baptism not so much by those in whose hands they were brought, (though by them too, if they were good and faithful men,) as by the whole society of saints. The whole Church was their mother; she brought forth all and every one by this new birth.' And therefore if any were to be charged with maintenance, it was but reasonable that the Church should maintain her own children. So that they, who lay so much stress upon sponsors undertaking for children, as if they thereby undertook to give them maintenance too, have no grounds for their assertion,

[21] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 266 d.) Aliquando etiam, quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet, nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum.

[22] Ibid. (t. 2. p. 266 a, b.) Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendam spiritalem gratiam, non tam ab eis, quorum gestantur manibus, quamvis et ab ipsis, si et ipsi boni fideles sunt, quam ab universa societate sanctorum atque fidelium.... Tota hoc ergo mater ecclesia, quæ in sanctis est, facit: quia tota omnes, tota singulos parit.

since it appears, from the best light that we have, to have been otherwise in the practice of the primitive Church.

I have not said this to excuse sponsors from any duty that properly belongs to them, but only to take off the force of an unreasonable objection which some have made against the present use of sponsors in baptism, as if they were of a different sort from those of the ancient Church, because they are not under this particular obligation, which appears not to have any other foundation but the bare surmise of those who make the objection.

But only to answer for them to the several interrogatories in baptism.

4. Two things indeed were anciently required of sponsors as their proper duty. First, to answer in their names to all the interrogatories of baptism. This seems to be intimated by Tertullian[23], where he speaks of the promises which the sponsors made in baptism, and of the danger there was of their failing to fulfil them, either by their own mortality, or by the untoward disposition of the party. But if any one thinks these promises related only to what the sponsors promised for themselves, and not in the name of the child, he may be informed more clearly from others. Gennadius[24] tells us these promises for infants and such as were uncapable of learning were made after the usual manner of interrogatories in baptism. And St. Austin[25] more particularly acquaints us with the form then used, which was, 'Doth this child believe in God? Doth he turn to God?' Which is the same as renouncing the Devil, and making a covenant with Christ. In other places[26] he tells

[23] De Bapt. c. 18. (p. 231 c.) Quid enim necesse est sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? Quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possint, et proventu malæ indolis falli.

[24] De Eccles. Dogmat. c. 52. (al. c. 22. int. Oper. August. juxt. Ed. Bened. t. 8. append. p. 78 b.) Si vero parvuli sunt, vel hebetes, qui doctrinam non capiant respondeant pro illis, qui eos offerunt, juxta morem baptizandi.

[25] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 266 g.) Interrogamus enim eos a quibus offeruntur, et dicimus, Credit in Deum? de illa ætate, quæ, utrum sit Deus, ignoret; respondent, Credit. Et ad cætera sic respondetur [al. respondent] singula, quæ quæruntur, &c. See the latter clauses of n. 28, following.

[26] Serm. 116. de Tempore, t. 10. p. 304. [al. Serm. 268. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 441 b.) Pro ipsis enim respondent [fidejussores], quod abrenuntient Diabolo, pompis, et operibus ejus. [Serm. 14. de Verb. Apost. c. 11. t. 10. p. 124. [al. Serm. 294. de Bapt. Parvul.] (t. 5. p. 1188 f.) Aut ut quid ei dicis ut credat? Hoc enim respondetur a portante parvulum . . . Credit in Jesum Christum? fit interrogatio: respondetur, Credit. Pro non loquente, pro silente, pro flente . . . respondetur et valet. Ed.]

us more expressly, 'that the sponsors answered for them, that they renounced the Devil, his pomps, and his works.' And, disputing against the Pelagians[27], he proves by this argument that children were under the power of Satan and the guilt of original sin, and needed pardon; because 'if a Pelagian himself brought a child to baptism he must answer for him, because he could not answer for himself, that he renounced the Devil, that he turned to God, and that among other things he believed the remission of sins; all which would only be fallaciously said, if children had no concern in them.' And he professes, 'he would not admit any child to baptism, whose sponsor he had reason to believe did not make these promises and responses sincerely for him.'

Of the form and practice then there is no dispute. Only it seemed a great difficulty to bishop Boniface, and as such he proposed it to St. Austin[28], 'How it could be said with truth that a child believed, or renounced the Devil, or turned to God, who had no thought or apprehension of these things; or if any, yet secret and unknown to us? If any one should ask us concerning a child, Whether he would prove chaste or a thief, when he became a man? we should doubtless in that case

[27] De Peccat. Merit. l. 1. c. 34. (t. 10. p. 35 d.) Vellem aliquis istorum, qui contraria sapiunt, mihi baptizandum parvulum afferret.... Ipse certe mihi fuerat responsurus pro eodem parvulo quem gestaret, quia pro se ille respondere non posset. Quomodo ergo dicturus erat, eum renuntiare Diabolo, cujus in eo nihil esset? Quomodo converti ad Deum, a quo non esset aversus? Credere inter cætera remissionem peccatorum, quæ illi nulla tribueretur? Ego quidem si contra hæc eum sentire existimarem, nec ad sacramenta cum parvulo intrare permitterem.

[28] [Ep. 23. ut supr. (t. 2. p. 266 f.) Si constituam, inquis, ante te parvulum, et interrogem, utrum, cum creverit, futurus sit castus, vel fur non sit futurus? sine dubio respondebis, Nescio. Et utrum, in eadem parvula ætate constitutus, cogitet aliquid boni vel mali?—dices, Nescio. Si itaque de moribus ejus futuris nihil audes certi promittere et de ejus præsenti cogitatione; quid est illud, quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, pro eis parentes, tanquam fidedictores, respondent, et dicunt illos facere, quod illa ætas cogitare non potest; aut, si potest, occultum est? Interrogamus enim eos, a quibus offeruntur, et dicimus, Credit in Deum? de illa ætate, quæ, utrum sit Deus, ignoret? respondent, Credit: et ad cætera sic respondetur [al. respondent] singula, quæ quæruntur. Unde miror parentes in istis rebus tam fidenter pro parvulo respondere, ut dicant, Eum tanta bona facere, quæ ad horam, qua baptizatur, baptizator interrogat, tamen eadem hora si subjiciam, Erit castus, qui baptizatur, aut non erit fur? nescio utrum audet dicere aliquis, Aliquid horum erit, aut non erit: sicut mihi sine dubitatione respondet, quod credat in Deum, et quod se convertat ad Deum. *Grischov.*]

answer, We know not. Or if the question was, Whether a child in his infancy thought good or evil? we should make the same answer, We know not. Since therefore no one would promise either for his future morals or his present thoughts, how is it that, when parents present their children as sponsors in baptism, they answer and say the children do those things which that age does not so much as think of; as, that they believe in God, and are turned unto him, &c.?' To this St. Austin answers, 'that the child is only said to believe, because he receives the sacrament of faith and conversion, which entitles him to the name of a believer. For the sacraments[29], because of the resemblance between them and the things represented by them, do carry the name of the things represented. Christ was but once offered in himself, and yet he is offered not only on the annual solemnity of the Passover, but every day for the people; and no one tells a lie that says he is offered. As therefore the sacrament of Christ's body after a certain manner is called his body, and the sacrament of his blood is called his blood; so the sacrament of faith is faith. And upon this account, when it is answered that an infant believes, who has not yet any knowledge, or habit of faith, the meaning of the answer is, that he has faith because of the sacrament of faith, and is converted to God because of the sacrament of conversion; for these answers appertain to the celebration of the sacrament.'

So that according to St. Austin, when an infant is said to have faith, the meaning is only that he receives the sacrament of faith, which faith he is bound to embrace when he comes to

[29] Ibid. (p. 267 e.) Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? Et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud credere quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. [See Serm. 14. de Verb. Apost. [al. Serm. 294.] c. 19., where he says they believe *fide parentum*. (t. 5. p. 1192 d.) Unde credunt? quomodo credunt? Fide parentum. Si fide parentum purgantur &c. Ed.]

understand it. In the mean time he is called a believer, because he receives the sacrament of faith, and is entered into the covenant of God by his sponsors, who supply that part for him which he cannot perform in his own person. This was the first duty of sponsors toward children.

And to be guardians of their spiritual life for the future.

5. The other was, that they were to be guardians of their spiritual life for the future, and to take care, by good admonitions and good instructions, that they performed their part of the covenant they were now engaged in. St. Austin[30] makes sponsors themselves concerned in this covenant with God, and therefore presses it as a duty upon them, 'that they should not only by their examples, but by their words and instructions, teach them the great duties of chastity, humility, sobriety, and peace; forasmuch as they had answered in their stead, that they renounced the Devil, his pomps, and his works.' And in another place[31] he more particularly specifies their obligations; 'that they should admonish them to live chastely, and preserve their virginity to marriage; to refrain their tongues from evil-speaking and perjury; not to accustom their mouths to filthy and lascivious songs; not to be proud nor envious, nor to retain anger nor hatred in their hearts; not to observe divination or soothsaying, nor to hang phylacteries or diabolical characters upon their own bodies or their relations;

[30] Serm. 116. de Tempore, t. 10. p. 304. [al. Serm. 268. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 441 a.) Et ideo non solum exemplis, sed etiam verbis eos ad omne opus bonum admonere debetis..... Postea quam baptizati fuerint, de castitate, de humilitate, de sobrietate, vel pace eos admonere vel docere non desinant, et agnoscant se fidejussores esse ipsorum. Pro ipsis enim respondent, quod abrenuntient Diabolo, pompis, et operibus ejus.

[31] Serm. 163. de Tempore, [al. Serm. 168. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 293 c, d.) Hoc itaque admoneo .... ut quoties paschalis solemnitas venit, quicunque viri, quæcunque mulieres, de sacro fonte filios spiritaliter exceperunt, cognoscant, se pro ipsis fidejussores apud Deum exstitisse, et ideo semper illis solicitudinem veræ caritatis impendant, [et] admoneant, ut castitatem custodiant, virginitatem usque ad nuptias servent, a maledicto vel perjurio linguam refrenent, cantica turpia vel luxuriosa ex ore non proferant, non superbiant, non invideant, iracundiam vel odium in corde non teneant, auguria non observent, phylacteria et characteres diabolicos nec sibi nec suis aliquando suspendant, præcantatores velut ministros Diaboli fugiant, fidem catholicam teneant, ad ecclesiam frequentius currant, contempta verbositate lectiones divinas attentis auribus audiant, peregrinos accipiant, et, secundum quod ipsis in baptismo dictum est, hospitum pedes lavent, pacem et ipsi teneant, et discordes ad concordiam revocare contendant, sacerdotibus et parentibus honorem et amorem veræ caritatis impendant.

to keep and hold the catholic faith; to frequent the church; to hear the Scriptures read with attention; to entertain strangers, and wash their feet, according to what was said to them in baptism; to live peaceably; to be peacemakers among disagreeing brethren; and to honour the priests and their parents with the love of sincere charity.' These were such things as they had promised for children in baptism, and therefore they were bound, by compact with God, to use their utmost endeavours to engage their spiritual pupils to perform them.

A second sort of sponsors for such adult persons as could not answer for themselves.

6. Another sort of sponsors were such as were appointed to make answers for such persons as by reason of some infirmity could not answer for themselves. I have observed before, that such adult persons as were suddenly struck speechless, or seized with a frensy by the violence of a distemper, might yet be baptized, if any of their friends could testify that they had beforehand desired baptism: and in this case the same friends became sponsors for them, making the very same answers for them as they did for children. This we learn from Cyril of Alexandria[32], who assures us, that when men were seized with extremity of sickness, and it was thought proper upon that account to baptize them, there were some appointed to make both the renunciations and confessions in their name. And so it is in the account which Fulgentius[33] gives of the African negro, who just before his baptism fell sick of a fever, which bereaved him of his senses, and made him speechless: he was baptized for all this, having his sponsors to answer in his name, as if it had been for an infant. So that all those canons[34] which speak of baptizing dumb persons in cases of extremity, though they do not expressly require sponsors for them, yet are to be understood as intending them, according to the usual practice of the Church. And if the party happened to recover after such a baptism, it was the sponsor's duty, not only to acquaint him, as a witness, with what was done for him, but also, as a guardian of his behaviour, to in-

[32] In Ioan. 11, 26. See before, ch. 7. s. 6. p. 129. n. 77.

[33] De Bapt. Æthiop. c. 7. p. 610. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 176 d. 1.)... Factum est, ut confessionem tempore præterito redditam, quia non potuit in hora baptismi reddere propter infirmitatem corporis, adjutorio fraternæ redderet caritatis.—Vid. Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 52. See n. 24, preceding.

[34] See ch. 5. s. 2. pp. 76—79, and nn. 27—32.

duce him to make good the promises which he in his name had made for him. For this was the indispensable duty of sureties in all cases whatsoever.

The third sort of sponsors, for all adult persons in general.

7. The third sort of sponsors were for such sort of adult persons as were able to answer for themselves. For these also had their sponsors, and no persons anciently were baptized without them. These are spoken of not only by Dionysius[35] and the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[36], but by many other more unquestionable writers. Victor Uticensis[37] tells us of one Muritta, a deacon, who was sponsor for Elpidiphorus at Carthage: and Palladius[38] says Evagrius Ponticus performed the same office for Rufinus, the great statesman and *præfectus-prætorio* under Arcadius. St. Austin often mentions them; but then he also acquaints us[39], 'that it was no part of their office to make responses for their pupils in baptism, as it was in the case of infants, and sick persons, who could not answer for themselves. For though the Church accepted it in the case of infants, by reason of their disability; yet she would not allow adult persons to answer by proxy, who were able to answer for themselves; there being something of natural reason in that saying in the Gospel, "He is of age, let him speak for himself."' [John 9, 21.] The most rustic capacities and meanest understandings, even in the weaker sex, would not ordinarily excuse them from doing this in their own persons, unless, as Genna-

[35] Eccles. Hierarch. c. 2. part. 2. n. 2. p. 252. (t. 1. p. 168 b.) Ὁ τούτων ἀγαπήσας τῶν ὄντως ὑπερκοσμίων τὴν ἱερὰν μετουσίαν, ἐλθὼν ἐπί τινα τῶν μεμυημένων, πείθει μὲν αὐτὸν ἡγήσασθαι αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν ἱεράρχην ὁδοῦ· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁλικῶς ἐπακολουθήσειν ἐπαγγέλλεται τοῖς παραδοθησομένοις, καὶ ἀξιοῖ τῆς τε προσαγωγῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμπάσης τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ ἑξῆς ζωῆς τὴν ἐπιστασίαν ἀναδέξασθαι. Τὸν δέ, τῆς μὲν ἐκείνου σωτηρίας ἱερῶς ἐρῶντα, πρὸς δὲ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος ὕψος ἀντιμετροῦντα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, φρίκη μὲν ἄφνω καὶ ἀμηχανία περιΐσταται· τελευτῶν δὲ ὅμως, ποιήσειν τὸ αἰτηθὲν ἀγαθοειδῶς ὡμολόγησε, καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἄγει πρὸς τὸν τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἐπώνυμον.

[36] L. 3. c. 16. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 288.) Τὸν μὲν ἄνδρα ὑποδεχέσθω ὁ διάκονος· τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα, ἡ διάκονος.

[37] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 3. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 7. p. 613. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. [l. 5.] p. 694 f. 10.) Hic dudum fuerat apud nos in ecclesia Fausti baptizatus, quem venerabilis Muritta diaconus de alveo fontis susceperat generatum.

[38] Hist. Lausiac. c. 12. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 915 a. 12.) ... Ἀποδέχεται τὸν Ῥουφῖνον ὁ ἅγιος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀχράντου βαπτίσματος.

[39] De Bapt. l. 4. c. 24. (t. 9. p. 141 a.) Ideo cum alii pro infantibus respondent, ut impleatur circa eos celebratio sacramenti, valet utique ad eorum consecrationem, quia ipsi respondere non possunt. At si pro eo, qui respondere potest, alius respondeat, non itidem valet, &c.

dius[40] says, they were so heavy and dull as not to be capable of learning; in which condition their sponsors were required to answer for them as for little children, from whom they differed so little in understanding.

Whose duty was, not to answer in their names, but only to admonish and instruct them before and after baptism.

8. But in ordinary cases this was no office of the sponsors, when men were in a capacity to answer for themselves. Their only business was to be curators and guardians of their spiritual life: to which purpose, it was incumbent on them to take care of their instruction and morals, as well before as after baptism. Upon this account the deaconesses were usually employed in the private instruction of women, to teach them how to make their responses in baptism. And this was one qualification required in deaconesses by some ancient canons[41], 'that they should be persons of such good understanding, as to be able to instruct the ignorant and rustic women how to make their responses to the interrogatories which the minister should put to them in baptism, and how to order their conversation afterward;' as has been observed in another place[42].

This office chiefly imposed upon deacons and deaconesses.

9. And by some ancient rules this office was chiefly imposed upon deaconesses, to be sponsors for women, as the deacons were obliged to be for men. For so the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[43] seems to represent it, 'when he orders a deacon to be susceptor for a man, and a deaconess for a woman, in baptism.' And we find the sacred virgins often mentioned as concerned in this office. St. Austin[44], as we heard before, speaks of them, 'as presenting exposed children to baptism, though they had no children of their own, nor intended to have any.' And in the Life of Epiphanius[45] we read, that as

[40] De Eccles. Dogmat. c. 52. See n. 24, preceding.

[41] C. Carth. 4. c. 12. (t. 2. p. 1201 a.) Viduæ vel sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sancto sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.

[42] See b. 2. ch. 22. s. 9. v. 1. p. 295.

[43] L. 3. c. 16. See n. 36, preceding.

[44] Ep. 23. [al. 98.] ad Bonifac. (t. 2. p. 266 d.) Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet, nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum. Quæ certe proprios filios non habuerunt ullos, nec habere disponunt, &c.

[45] N. 8. (ap. Oper. Epiphan. t. 2. p. 324 b.) Μετὰ οὖν τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου εἰσῆλθεν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐν τῷ φωτιστηρίῳ· καὶ ἐκέλευσεν εἰσελθεῖν Ἐπιφάνιον καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφὴν, καὶ Λουκιανὸν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, ὃς καὶ πατὴρ αὐτῷ ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου φωτίσματος. . . . Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ξ᾽ ἡμέ-

one Lucian was his godfather in baptism, so Bernice, a sacred virgin, was godmother to his sister. Whence it appears, that at first the sacred virgins and monastics were thought as proper persons as any to take this weighty office upon them. Though afterward in the French Church, by a canon of the Council of Auxerre[46], monks are prohibited from being sponsors in baptism: and so the prohibition stands in the Romish Church to this day.

What persons prohibited from being sponsors.

10. But anciently there was no prohibition of any sorts of men from performing this charitable office, save only of such as unqualified themselves by going contrary to the rules of the Christian religion. Fathers, as we heard before, were frequently sponsors for their own children: and I know of no prohibition of this before the time of Charles the Great, when the Council of Mentz made a decree[47] against it, forbidding fathers to be susceptors to their own sons or daughters at the font in baptism. Anciently also presbyters and deacons were allowed to be sponsors, though this is also now prohibited in some provincial Councils of the Romish Church by Cardinal Borromæo[48] in the last age. But the only persons whom the Ancients excluded from this office, were catechumens, energumens, heretics, and penitents; that is, persons who either were yet never in full communion with the Church, as being themselves unbaptized; or else such as had forfeited the privileges of their baptism and church-communion by their errors, or crimes, or incapacity to assist others, who needed assistance themselves. And by some canons[49], persons who were never

ρας ἔλαβεν Ἐπιφάνιος Λουκιανὸν καὶ Βερνίκην τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον, ἥτις ἐγένετο μήτηρ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Ἐπιφανίου, καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

[46] C. 25. (t. 5. p. 960 a.) Non licet abbati filium [al. filios] de baptismo suscipere [al. habere], nec monachis commatres habere.

[47] An. 813. c. 55. (t. 7. p. 1252 c.) Nullus igitur proprium filium vel filiam de fonte baptismatis suscipiat.

[48] Synod. Diœces. 2. decret. 17. [ap. Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis, &c. Mediolan. 1599. fol. (Actor. pars 2. decret. 17. p. 338. col. dextr.) Clericis, qui sacris ordinibus initiati sunt, infantem de sacro baptismi fonte suscipere vitium sit; iidemque in confirmationis sacramento compatres non sint.—Conf. ibid. (Actor. pars 4. p. 501. col. sinistr.) . . . . Nec vero [parochus, qui baptismum conficit,] monachos, regulares, clericosve sæculares sacris initiatos, ad infantem de baptismo suscipiendum adhiberi sinet. Ed.]

[49] C. Mogunt. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. 4. c. 102. (t. 1. p. 2014. 11.) In baptismate, vel in chrismate, non potest alium suscipere in filiolum, qui non est ipse baptizatus vel confirmatus.

confirmed were excluded from being sponsors, both in baptism and confirmation.

But one sponsor required, and that a man for a man, and a woman for a woman.

11. From what has been said, the reader will also easily observe, that anciently no more than one sponsor was required, and that was a man for a man, and a woman for a woman; for we never read of more than one in all the accounts of the Ancients, and one of the same sex for adult persons. In the case of infants, there was no regard had to the difference of sex: for a virgin might be sponsor for a man-child and a father for his own children, whether they were male or female: and one sponsor was sufficient in any case. Some rules forbid more than one, either in baptism or confirmation: as that decree of Leo, cited by Gratian[50], which says, 'No more than one, whether man or woman, shall be admitted as surety for a child in baptism: and the like is to be observed in confirmation.' Which rule was renewed and confirmed by the Council of Mentz[51], but upon a reason which is something peculiar; for they conclude, 'that because there is but one God, one faith, one baptism, therefore an infant ought to have only one sponsor, whether man or woman, at his baptism:' which I mention not for the excellency of the reason, but only to show what conformity it bears to the ancient practice.

When first it became a law that sponsors might not marry a spiritual relation.

12. Some perhaps will here be desirous to know the original of that practice in the Romish Church, which is the occasion of so many dispensations in matrimonial causes, arising from the prohibition of sponsors or godfathers marrying within the forbidden degrees of spiritual relation.

Now that which seems to have given the first tendency towards this was a law of Justinian, still exstant in the Code[52],

[50] De Consecrat. distinct. 4. c. 101. (ibid. p. 2013. 83.) Non plures ad suscipiendum de baptismo infantem accedant, quam unus, sive vir, sive mulier. In confirmatione quoque id ipsum fiat.

[51] C. 12., cited by Vicecomes, [de Ritibus Baptismi, l. 1. c. 34. (pp. 196, 197.) Plures quoque ne baptizatum de lavacro susciperent, sed ut unus tantum, vel una, veteri consuetudine receptum erat. De quo Leo Pontifex apud Gratianum de Consecratione, distinct. 4. c. 15, &c. —Atque hoc decretum .... rursus Concilium Metense c. 12. renovavit his verbis: .... Et infantem nequaquam duo, vel plures, sed unus a fonte baptismatis suscipiat.... Nam unus Deus, unum baptisma, unus, qui a fonte suscipit, debet esse pater, vel mater infantis.—I find no notice of this canon in Labbe and Cossart.—Ed.]

[52] Cod. l. 5. t. 4. de Nuptiis, leg. 26. (t. 4. p. 1142. ad calc.) Ea videlicet persona omnimodo ad nuptias venire prohibenda, quam aliquis,

wherein he 'forbids any man to marry a woman, whether she be a slave or free, for whom he had been godfather in baptism when she was a child: because nothing does induce a more paternal affection, or juster prohibition of marriage, than this tie by which their souls are in a divine manner united together.' Now this law extended no further than to prohibit marriage in this immediate relation: and it could not affect very many, whilst parents were commonly sponsors for their own children, and the sacred virgins or the deaconesses or the clergy for others; and men were sponsors for men, and women for women. But afterward this was improved a little further: for the Council of Trullo[53] 'forbids the godfather not only to marry the infant, but the mother of the infant, for whom he answers; and orders them that have done so, first to be separated, then to do the penance of fornicators.' This prohibition was extended to more degrees in the following ages, and grew so extravagant, that the Council of Trent[54] thought it a matter worthy of their reformation; though still by their rules this spiritual relation was extended to more degrees than either the laws of Justinian or the canons of Trullo had prohibited. For they forbid marriage not only between the sponsors and their children, but also between the sponsors themselves; and the father and mother of the baptized is not to marry a sponsor, nor may the baptizer marry the baptized, nor the father or mother of the baptized, because of the spiritual relation that is contracted between them. But they forbid above two sponsors to appear for a child, and if more than two appear, they are not bound by this law of spiritual relation, though the Canon Law[55] had determined otherwise in former ages.

sive alumna sit, sive non, a sacrosancto suscepit baptismate; cum nihil aliud sic inducere potest paternam affectionem, et justam nuptiarum prohibitionem, quam hnjusmodi nexus, per quem, Deo mediante, animæ eorum copulatæ sunt.

[53] C. 53. (t. 6. p. 1167 a.) Ἐπειδὴ μείζων ἡ κατὰ πνεῦμα οἰκειότης τῆς τῶν σωμάτων συναφείας· ἔγνωμεν δὲ ἔν τισι τόποις τινὰς ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος παῖδας ἀναδεχομένους, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ταῖς ἐκείνων μητράσι χηρευούσαις γαμικὸν συναλλάσσοντας συνοικέσιον· ὁρίζομεν ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος μηδὲν τοιοῦτο πραχθῆναι· εἰ δέ τινες μετὰ τὸν παρόντα κανόνα φωραθεῖεν τοῦτο ποιοῦντες, προτοτύπως μὲν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀφιστάσθωσαν τοῦ παρανόμου τούτου συνοικεσίου· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς τῶν πορνευόντων ἐπιτιμίοις ὑποβληθήτωσαν.

[54] Sess. 24. de Reform. Matrimon. c. 2. (t. 14. p. 877 e.) Inter quos [susceptores] ac baptizatum ipsum, et illius patrem ac matrem, necnon inter baptizantem et baptizatum, baptizatique patrem ac matrem, tantum spiritualis cognatio contrahatur.

[55] Sextus, Decretal. l. 4. tit. 3. de

Yet after all their regulations about this matter, there remain a thousand difficulties to exercise the pens of the Roman casuists, which the reader that is curious may find referred to by Sotcallus and Barbosa[56] in their Declarations and Remissions on the Council of Trent.

Why the names of the sponsors ordered to be registered in the books of the Church.

13. There is one thing indeed ordered by that Council, which was anciently of good use, though not for the purpose for which they appointed it: that is, that not only the names of the baptized, but also the names of the sponsors should be registered in the books of the Church. The Council of Trent[57] orders it, only that men might know what persons were forbidden to marry by this spiritual relation. But anciently it had a much better use, that the Church might know who were sponsors, and that they might be put in mind of their duty, by being entered upon record, which was a standing memorial of their obligations. This custom we find mentioned in the author under the name of Dionysius[58], where he describes the ceremony of admitting catechumens together with their sponsors. The bishop first explains to the catechumen the laws and rules of a divine life and conversation, and then asks him whether he purposes so to live, which when he has promised, he lays his hand upon his head, and orders the priests to register both the man and his sponsor. Afterward he speaks of reciting

Cognatione Spirituali,· c. 3. (ap. Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 3. p. 606. 23.) ... Si tamen plures accesserint, spiritualis cognatio inde contrahitur, matrimonia contrahenda impediens, et etiam post contracta dissolvens.

[56] Canones Concilii Tridentini cum Remissionibus Barbosæ, Colon. 1621. [Juxt. Catalog. Biblioth. Bodleian. Oxon. 1843. (p. 666.) Sacros. Concilii Tridentini Canones et Decreta: item Declarationes Cardinalium Concilii Interpretum, ex ultima recogn. Jo. Gallemart; cum citationibus Jo. Sotealli et Hor. Lutii, nec non Remissionibus Augustini Barbosæ, &c. Colon. Agripp. 1620.—Ed.]

[57] [C. Trident. loc. supr. citat. n. 54. (ibid. e.) Parochus, antequam ad baptismum conferendum accedat, diligenter ab iis, ad quos spectabit, sciscitetur, quem vel quos elegerint, ut baptizatum de sacro fonte suscipiant: et eum vel eos tantum ad illum suscipiendum admittat, et in libro eorum nomina describat; doceatque eos, quam cognationem contraxerint, ne ignorantia ulla excusari valeant. *Grischov.*]

[58] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 2. n. 5. p. 253. (t. 1. p. 168 d. ult. lin.) [Ἱεράρχης] μαρτύρεται μὲν αὐτῷ τὴν ὀφειλομένην ὁλικὴν γενέσθαι προσέλευσιν, ὡς παντελείῳ καὶ ἀμώμῳ ὄντι Θεῷ· καὶ τὴν ἔνθεον αὐτῷ πολιτείαν ὑφηγησάμενος, καὶ προσερωτήσας, Εἰ οὕτω πολιτεύσαιτο; μετὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐπιτίθησιν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ τὴν χεῖρα· καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἀπογράψασθαι κελεύει τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν ἀνάδοχον. [Ibid. part. 2. n. 7. p. 254. (p. 169 c.)..... Καί τινος ἱερέως ἐκ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν ἀνάδοχον κηρύξαντος, κ.τ.λ. Ed.]

their names out of these registers, when men were presented by their sponsors immediately to be baptized.

And thus much of the use of sponsors in the primitive Church.

CHAP. IX.

Of the unction and the sign of the cross in baptism.

1. We find in some of the ancient Ritualists, but not in all, mention made of an unction preceding baptism, and used by way of preparation for it. They, who first describe it, speak of it as used either immediately after the confession of faith, as the author of the Constitutions[59]; or else between the renunciation and the confession, as Cyril of Jerusalem[60] describes it. But there is no mention of this unction either in Justin Martyr or Tertullian. For though Tertullian speaks of an unction among the ceremonies of baptism; yet as Daille[61]

Of the first original of unction in baptism.

[59] Apost. l. 7. c. 41. [Labb. c. 42.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 380.).... Καὶ, *μετὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ταύτην, κατ' ἀκολουθίαν ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐλαίου χρίσιν.*

[60] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. nn. 3, 4. (p. 312 b, d.) Εἶτα *ἀποδυθέντες ἐλαίῳ ἠλείφεσθε ἐπορκιστῷ, ἀπ' ἄκρων τριχῶν κορυφῆς ἕως τῶν κάτω, καὶ κοινωνοὶ ἐγένεσθε τῆς καλλιελαίου,* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.... Μετὰ *ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος ἐχειραγωγεῖσθε κολυμβήθραν, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον μνῆμα· καὶ ἠρωτᾶτο ἕκαστος, εἰ πιστεύει εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν, καὶ κατεδύετε τρίτον εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε, κ. τ. λ.*

[61] De Confirmat. l. 2. c. 11. (p. 180 ad calc.) Sunt enim apud hunc, [auctorem Constitutionum,] quæ nusquam in superiorum temporum monumentis deprehendimus, nonnulla; quale illud est, quod baptizandi oleo unguuntur, antequam tingantur; quodque tincti, non oleo, sed *μύρῳ*, id est, unguento, chrismantur; quorum neutrum hactenus in ullo vetustiorum observavimus. Nam ubi hic noster de diaconissarum ministerio agit, id in primis tradit, cum mulieres baptizantur, diaconum earum modo frontem linere sancto oleo; tum diaconissam eas perungere. Deinde totum baptismi ordinem sequenti capite [l. 3. c. 15.] enarrans, *Σὺ μὲν οὖν*, inquit, *ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, ἐκείνῳ τῷ τύπῳ χρίσεις τὴν κεφαλὴν τῶν βαπτιζομένων, εἴτε ἄνδρων εἴτε γυναικῶν, τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλαίῳ εἰς τύπον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ βαπτίσματος· ἔπειτα ἢ σὺ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ ὑπό σε πρεσβύτερος, τὴν ἱερὰν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰπὼν καὶ ἐπονομάσας ἐπίκλησιν Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, βαπτίσεις αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὕδατι· καὶ τὸν μὲν ἄνδρα ὑποδεχέσθω ὁ διάκονος· τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα ἡ διάκονος·* .... *καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος χριέτω τοὺς βαπτισθέντας τῷ μύρῳ.* Hæc ille: in quibus duas, ut dixi, vides unctiones; priorem ex oleo ante tinctionem sive lotionem; posteriorem post lotionem, *ἐκ τοῦ μύρου*, ex unguento, Atqui unam hactenus audiveramus, eamque post tinctionem, et quidem, ut videtur, ex simplici oleo: certe nusquam in ea describenda, *τοῦ μύρου*, id est, unguenti ex pluribus compositi, occurrit mentio. Fac memineris Tertulliani, qui totum baptismi ritum accuratissime descripsit. Nihil præter ista apud eum occurrit. Ergo circa hæc tempora, id est, paullo post quarti sæculi

rightly observes, it was not this unction preceding baptism, but the unction which followed after it in confirmation, accompanied with imposition of hands, which belongs to another subject. For it is plain from Tertullian[62] that neither of these were given before baptism, but when men were come out of the water, then they were anointed with the holy unction, and had imposition of hands, in order to receive the Holy Ghost. Whence I think Daille's conjecture very just and reasonable, that the unction preceding baptism is of later date, and was not as yet adopted among the ceremonies of baptism in the time of Tertullian.

Of the difference betwixt this and chrism in confirmation.

2. But the writers of the following ages speak distinctly of *two unctions*, the one before, the other after baptism: which they describe by different names and different ceremonies, to distinguish them one from the other. The first they commonly call χρίσιν μυστικοῦ ἐλαίου, *the unction of the mystical oil*, and the other χρίσιν μύρου, or χρίσμα, *the unction of chrism*. They both agree in this, that the bishop only consecrated them, whether for the use of baptism or confirmation. The author of the Constitutions gives us a form of consecration to be used by the bishop in sanctifying oil for this unction before baptism[63], where he prays to God, 'that he would sanctify the oil in the name of the Lord Jesus, and grant it spiritual grace, and efficacious power, that it might be subservient to the remission of sins, and the preparation of men to make their

initia, facta videtur illa mutatio; nempe ut, cum primum ex oleo simplici inungerentur, de sacro lavacro egressi, tum oleo balsamum addi placuerit ex Mosaico typo; quod hujusmodi unguentum significandæ regiæ ac sacerdotali dignitati, in quam per baptismum inaugurantur credentes, aptius quam simplex oleum videretur. Pax Constantini principatu, una cum magnis opibus, facile Christianis hujusmodi consilia exornandæ suorum initiationis suggessit. Sed et priorem ex oleo unctionem, tametsi hac ex balsamo de novo instituta, retinere tamen placuit; ut aliquid baptismo dignitatis etiam ipsa conferret. Itaque in baptismi anteriora submota est, ut tinctioni præiret, et ad eam pararet; loco vero, quo ipsa prius fuerat, tinctionem nova exciperet ex unguento nobiliori unctio, &c.

[62] De Bapt. c. 7. (p. 226 d.) Exinde egressi de lavacro perunguimur benedicta unctione de pristina disciplina, qua ungui oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant, &c.

[63] Lib. 7. c. 42. [Labb. c. 43.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 380.) Ἐπικαλεῖται... Θεὸν ... ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ τὸ ἔλαιον τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ δώσῃ χάριν πνευματικὴν, καὶ δύναμιν ἐνεργητικὴν, ἄφεσίν τε ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ προπαρασκευὴν ὁμολογίας βαπτίσματος· ὥστε τὸν χριόμενον, ἀπολυθέντα πάσης ἀσεβείας, ἄξιον γενέσθαι τῆς μυήσεως κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς.

profession in baptism; that such as were anointed therewith, being freed from all impiety, might become worthy of the initiation according to the command of his only-begotten Son.' And this power of consecration is reserved to the bishop in all the canons of the ancient Councils, of which more, when we come to speak of confirmation.

In the mean time I observe, first, that these two went by different names. The author of the Constitutions[64] calls the first *mystical oil*, and the other *mystical chrism*, and has a distinct form of consecration for each of them. And the same distinction in name is observed by Cyril of Jerusalem[65] and the authors under the name of Justin Martyr[66] and Dionysius[67]. Secondly, they differed in the time of administering them. For the one was given before the party went into the water, the other after he came out of it again. Which is clear from all the forementioned authors, and from St. Ambrose[68], who speaks of an unction with oil before baptism. As also the author of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanus[69], who tells persons that were to be baptized, 'that they were first to be anointed with oil consecrated by prayer.' Thirdly, they differed in respect to the persons concerned in the administration. For the unction before baptism was often

[64] Ibid. c. 42., cui titulus est, *Περὶ χρίσματος τοῦ μυστικοῦ ἐλαίου εὐχαριστία.*—Et c. 44., *Περὶ τοῦ μυστικοῦ μύρου εὐχαριστία.*—Vid. l. 3. c. 17. See n. 84, following.

[65] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. n. 3. (p. 312 b.) *Εἶτα ἀποδυθέντες ἐλαίῳ ἠλείφεσθε ἐπορκιστῷ, κ. τ. λ.*—Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 2. (p. 316 d.) *Ὑμεῖς δὲ μύρῳ ἐχρίσθητε, κοινωνοὶ καὶ μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενόμενοι.*—Ibid. n. 4. (p. 317 c.) *Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησιν, ἐξελθὼν κατηγωνίσατο τὸν ἀντικείμενον· οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, μετὰ τὸ ἱερὸν βάπτισμα καὶ τὸ μυστικὸν χρίσμα, ἐνδεδυμένοι τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἵστασθε πρὸς τὴν ἀντικειμένην δύναμιν.*

[66] Respons. ad Orthod. quæst. 137. (p. 486 c.) *Χριόμεθα δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ ἐλαίῳ, ἵνα γινώμεθα χριστοί· τῷ δὲ μύρῳ, πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τὴν χρίσιν τοῦ μύρου ἐνταφιασμὸν ἑαυτοῦ λογιζομένου.*

[67] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 2. n. 7. p. 253. (t. 1. p. 169 b.) *Καὶ τελείως ἀπαμφιεσάντων αὐτὸν τῶν λειτουργῶν, κομίζουσι μὲν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ τῆς χρίσεως ἅγιον ἔλαιον· ὁ δὲ τῆς χρίσεως διὰ τοῦ σφραγίσαι τρὶς ἀπαρξάμενος, τὸ λοιπὸν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα χρίσαι πανσώμως παραδοὺς, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἔρχεται, κ. τ. λ. . . . . Ἐπὶ τὸν ἱεράρχην αὖθις ἀπάγουσιν· ὁ δὲ, τῷ θεουργικωτάτῳ μύρῳ τὸν ἄνδρα σφραγισάμενος, μέτοχον ἀποφαίνει λοιπὸν τῆς ἱεροτελεστικωτάτης εὐχαριστίας.*

[68] De Sacrament. l. 1. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 350 b. n. 4.) Venimus ad fontem. . . .Unctus es quasi athleta Christi, quasi luctamen [al. luctam] hujus sæculi luctaturus.

[69] Recognit. l. 3. c. 67. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 531.) Baptizabitur autem unusquisque vestrum. . . . perunctus primo oleo per orationem sanctificato.

done by a deacon or a deaconess: but that after baptism, by the bishop himself most commonly, or at least by a presbyter, in some peculiar cases. The author of the Constitutions[70], speaking particularly of the unction before the baptism of women, orders the bishop to anoint the head, the deacon the forehead, and the deaconesses the other parts of the body. But the chrism after baptism is reserved to the bishop only. Lastly, they differed in the design and intent of them. For the design of the first unction was to prepare them for baptism, and enter them on their combat with Satan as champions of Christ; the other was to consummate and confirm their baptism with the consignation or seal of the Holy Spirit.

The design of this unction, and the reason of it.

3. Cyril of Jerusalem[71], speaking of the former unction, says 'men were anointed from head to foot with this exorcized or consecrated oil, and this made them partakers of the true olive-tree, Jesus Christ. For they, being cut out of a wild olive-tree, and ingrafted into a good olive-tree, were made partakers of the fatness of the good olive-tree. Therefore that exorcized oil was a symbol of their partaking of the fatness of Christ, and an indication of the flight and destruction of the adverse power. For as the insufflations of the saints, and invocation of God, do, like a vehement flame, burn and put the devils to flight; so this exorcized oil, by prayer and invocation of God, gains such a power, as not only to burn up and purge away the footsteps of sin, but also to repel all the powers of the invisible wicked one, the Devil.' St. Ambrose[72] compares it

[70] L. 3. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 287.) *Πρῶτον μὲν, ἐν τῷ φωτίζεσθαι γυναῖκας, ὁ διάκονος χρίσει μὲν μόνον τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλαίῳ, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἡ διάκονος ἀλείψει αὐτάς· . . . . ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς χρίσει ὁ ἐπίσκοπος.*— Ibid. c. 16. (p. 288.) *Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος χριέτω τοὺς βαπτισθέντας τῷ μύρῳ.*

[71] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. n. 3. (p. 312 b.) *Εἶτα ἀποδυθέντες ἐλαίῳ ἠλείφεσθε ἐπορκιστῷ, ἀπ' ἄκρων τριχῶν κορυφῆς ἕως τῶν κάτω· καὶ κοινωνοὶ ἐγίνεσθε τῆς καλλιελαίου, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐκκοπέντες γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἀγριελαίου, ἐνεκεντρίζεσθε εἰς τὴν καλλιέλαιον, καὶ κοινωνοὶ ἐγίνεσθε τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἐλαίας. Τὸ οὖν ἐπορκιστὸν ἔλαιον σύμβολον ἦν τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς πιότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, φυγαδευτήριον τυγχάνον παντὸς ἴχνους ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας. Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ἐμφυσήματα τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπίκλησις, ὥσπερ σφοδροτάτη φλὸξ, καίει καὶ ἐκδιώκει δαίμονας· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐπορκιστὸν τοῦτο ἔλαιον, ἐπικλήσει Θεοῦ καὶ εὐχῇ, δύναμιν τηλικαύτην λαμβάνει, ὥστε οὐ μόνον καῖον τὰ ἴχνη τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποκαθαίρει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσας ἀοράτους τοῦ Πονηροῦ ἐκδιώκει τὰς δυνάμεις.*

[72] De Sacrament. l. 1. c. 2. See n. 68, preceding.

to the anointing of wrestlers before they enter their combat. 'Thou camest to the font,' says he, 'and wast anointed as a champion of Christ, to fight the fight of this world.' The author under the name of Justin Martyr[73], distinguishing between the two unctions, says, 'Men were first anointed with the ancient oil, that they might be *christs*, (that is, *the anointed* of God); but they were anointed with the precious ointment, after baptism, in remembrance of him who reputed the anointing of himself with ointment to be his burial.' The author of the Constitutions[74] likewise uses the same distinction: 'Thou shalt first of all anoint him with the holy oil, then baptize him with water, and afterward sign him with the ointment: that the anointing with oil may be the participation of the Holy Spirit, and the water may be the symbol of death, and the signing with ointment may be the seal of the compact made with God. But if there be neither oil nor ointment, water is sufficient both for the unction and the seal and the confession of him with whom we die.' So that this was only a ceremony of baptism, which might be omitted without any detriment to the substance or essential part of it. To these may be added the testimony of St. Chrysostom[75], who says, 'Every person, before he was baptized, was anointed, as were wrestlers entering the field: and this not as the high priest was anointed of old, only on the head, or right hand, or ear, but all over his body, because he came not only to be taught, but to exercise himself in a fight or combat.'

This is the account which they give of this unction preceding baptism.

4. Dr. Cave[76] and some other learned persons are of opinion

The sign of the cross

[73] Respons. ad Orthodox. quæst. 137. See n. 66, preceding.

[74] L. 7. c. 22. [Labb. c. 23.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 368.) Χρίσεις δὲ πρῶτον τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ· ἔπειτα βαπτίσεις ὕδατι, καὶ τελευταῖον σφραγίσεις μύρῳ· ἵνα τὸ μὲν χρίσμα μετοχὴ ᾖ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ σύμβολον τοῦ θανάτου, τὸ δὲ μύρον σφραγὶς τῶν συνθηκῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[75] Hom. 6. in Col. p. 1358. (t. 11. p. 369 d, e.) Ἀλείφεται ὥσπερ οἱ ἄθληται εἰς στάδιον ἐμβησόμενοι, . . . οὐ καθάπερ οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ παλαιὸν τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνον, μᾶλλον δὲ μειζόνως· ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ τὴν κεφαλὴν, τὸ οὖς τὸ δεξιὸν, τὴν χεῖρα, ἵνα καὶ πρὸς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ἔργα ἀγαθὰ αὐτὸν διεγείρῃ· οὗτος δὲ τὸ πᾶν· οὐ γὰρ διδαχθησόμενος ἔρχεται μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀθλήσων καὶ γυμνασθησόμενος.

[76] Primitive Christianity, part. 1. ch. 10. p. 318. (p. 154. last word.) Together with this [the unction] we may suppose it was that the sign of the cross was made upon the forehead of the party baptized, &c.

frequently used in the ceremonies of baptism. First, in the admission of catechumens. And, secondly, in the time of exorcism.

that, together with this unction, the sign of the cross was made upon the forehead of the party baptized. And there is no question to be made of this, though all the passages they refer to are not direct proofs of it. For many of them relate to the sign of the cross in the unction of chrism, or confirmation. As particularly that unction which Tertullian speaks of, and the sign of the cross accompanying it, was not the unction before baptism, but that which followed in confirmation, as I have showed before in the beginning of this chapter. Therefore, to understand this matter exactly, we are to distinguish at least *four several times when the sign of the cross was used* during the preparation or consummation of the ceremonies of baptism. First, at the admission of catechumens to the state of catechumenship and the general name of Christians. Secondly, in the time of exorcism and imposition of hands, while they were passing through the several stages of catechumens. Thirdly, at the time of this unction before baptism. Fourthly, and lastly, at the unction of confirmation, which was then usually the conclusion of baptism, both in adult persons and infants; and many of the passages, which speak of the sign of the cross in baptism, do plainly relate to this, as an appendage of baptism and closely joined to it, as the last ceremony and consummation of it. The use of this sign in the admission of catechumens I have already showed before[77] from St. Austin, and the Life of Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza. And the frequent use of it in exorcism, and imposition of hands and prayer, during their catechetical exercises, has also been noted[78] in treating of them from St. Austin and St. Ambrose, which I therefore need not here repeat.

Thirdly, in this unction before baptism.

5. The third use of it was in this unction before baptism. For so the author under the name of Dionysius[79], describing the ceremony of anointing the party before the consecration of the water, says, 'the bishop begins the unction by thrice signing him with the sign of the cross, and then commits him to the priests to be anointed all over the body, whilst he goes and

[77] B. 10. ch. 1. s. 3. v. 3. p. 442.

[78] Ibid. ch. 2. s. 8. v. 3. p. 457.

[79] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 2. n. 7. p. 253. (t. 1. p. 169 c.) Ὁ δὲ τρὶς χρίσεως διὰ τοῦ σφραγίσαι τρὶς ἀπαρξάμενος, τὸ λοιπὸν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα χρίσαι πανσώμως παραδοὺς, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἔρχεται, καὶ τὸ ταύτης ὕδωρ ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπικλήσεσι καθαγιάσας καὶ τρισὶ τοῦ παναγεστάτου μύρου σταυροειδέσι χύσεσι τελειώσας, κ. τ. λ.

consecrates the water in the font.' St. Austin[80] also may be understood of this, when he says, 'the cross is always joined with baptism.' And by this we may interpret several passages in Cyprian, as where he tells Demetrian[81], 'They only escape who are born again, and signed with the sign of Christ: and what that sign is, and on what part of the body it is made, the Lord signified in another place, saying, "Go through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon their foreheads."' [Ezek. 9, 4.] And so again in his Book of the Unity of the Church[82], speaking of Uzziah's leprosy, he says, 'he was marked for his offence against the Lord in that part of his body, where those are signed who obtain his mercy.' Which seems plainly to refer to the sign of the cross made in baptism. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions[83] is very express in this matter. For, explaining the meaning of the several parts and ceremonies used in baptism, he says, 'The water is to represent Christ's burial, the oil to represent the Holy Ghost, the sign of the cross to represent the cross, and the ointment, or chrism, the confirmation of men's professions.' And not improbably St. Jerom[84] might refer to this, though his words be not so restrained to this time of unction, when he says, 'he was a Christian, born of Christian parents, and carried the banner of the cross in his forehead.' Some add also those words of Cyprian[85], 'Let us guard our foreheads, that

[80] Serm. 101. de Tempore, p. 290. [al. Serm. 32. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 65 b.) Semper enim cruci baptisma jungitur.

[81] Ad Demetrian. p. 194. (p. 134.) Evadere enim eos solos posse, qui renati et signo Christi signati fuerint, alio in loco Deus loquitur; quando, ad vastationem mundi et interitum generis humani angelos suos mittens, gravius in ultimo comminatur, dicens, Vadite et cædite, et nolite parcere oculis vestris. Nolite misereri senioris, aut juvenis, et virginis: et parvulos et mulieres interficite, ut perdeleantur. Omnem autem, super quem signum scriptum est, ne tetigeritis. Quod autem sit hoc signum, et qua in corporis parte positum, manifestat alio in loco Deus, dicens: *Transi per medium Hierusalem, et notabis signum super frontes virorum, &c.*

[82] De Unit. Eccles. p. 116. (p. 84.) . . In fronte maculatus est, ea parte corporis notatus, offenso Domino, ubi signantur qui Dominum promerentur.

[83] L. 3. c. 17. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 288.) *Τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἀντὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ἡ σφραγὶς ἀντὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας.*

[84] Ep. 113. Præfat. in Job, t. 3. (t. 9. p. 1099.) . . . Ego Christianus, et de parentibus Christianis natus, et vexillum crucis in mea fronte portans.

[85] Ep. 1. [al. 58.] p. 125. (p. 258.) Muniatur frons, ut signum Dei incolume servetur.

we may preserve the sign of God without danger.' And those of Pontius in his Life[87], where, speaking of the Christian confessors, who were branded by the Heathen in the forehead, and sent as slaves into the mines, he says, 'they were marked in the forehead a second time;' alluding to the sign of the cross, which as Christians they had received before.

But these passages do not necessarily relate to baptism, but are only general expressions that may refer to the use of the sign of the cross upon any other occasion: it being usual in those times to sign themselves upon the forehead in the commonest actions of their lives, upon every motion, as Tertullian[88] expresses it, 'at their going out and coming in, at their going to bath, or to bed, or to meals, or whatever their employment or occasions called them to.' Yet thus far it may be argued from them, that they who used it so commonly upon all other occasions, would hardly omit it in this solemn unction of baptism. And therefore these allegations may be allowed to be a sort of collateral evidence of the practice.

Fourthly, in the unction of confirmation.

6. Lastly, it was always used in the unction of confirmation; and that being then an appendage to baptism, what was done in it was many times said to be done in baptism: and so both the unction and sign of the cross used in confirmation are ascribed to baptism, and upon that account sometimes mistaken

[87] Vit. Cypr. p. 4. (p. 5.) ... Confessores frontium notatarum secunda inscriptione signatos.

[88] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 b.) Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calceatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus.—Conf. Cyril. H. Catech. 4. n. 10. [al. 14.] (p. 58 c.) *Μὴ τοίνυν ἐπαισχυνθῶμεν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀλλὰ κἂν ἄλλος ἀποκρύπτῃ, σὺ φανερῶς ἐπὶ μετώπῳ σφραγίζου, ἵνα οἱ δαίμονες, τὸ σημεῖον ἰδόντες τὸ βασιλικὸν, μακρὰν φύγωσι τρέμοντες· ποίει δὲ τοῦτο τὸ σημεῖον, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καθήμενος, κοιταζόμενος, ἐξανιστάμενος, λαλῶν, περιπατῶν, ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐν παντὶ πράγματι.*—Catech. 13. n. 19. [al. 36.] (p. 200 c.) *Ἐπὶ μετώπου μετὰ παρρησίας δακτύλοις ἡ σφραγὶς, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων ὁ σταυρὸς γενέσθω· ἐπὶ ἄρτων βιβρωσκομένων, καὶ ἐπὶ ποτηρίων πινομένων, ἐν εἰσόδοις, ἐν ἐξόδοις, πρὸ τοῦ ὕπνου κοιταζομένοις, καὶ διανισταμένοις, ὁδεύουσι, καὶ ἠρεμοῦσι.* [Conf. ib. n. 22. (p. 194 a.) *Λάβε τὰ ὅπλα, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]—Chrysost. Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. [juxt. Ed. Bened. Catech. 2.] (t. 2. p. 244 c.).... *Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦτου καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου διατύπωσον. οὕτω γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἄνθρωπος ἀπαντῶν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Διάβολος βλάψαι τι δυνήσεται, μετὰ τούτων σε ὁρῶν τῶν ὅπλων πανταχοῦ φαινόμενον.* [See also Hom. 13. in Phil. p. 1295., where he says it was used in baptism and ordination. (t. 11. p. 298 a.) *Μάθε πόση τοῦ σταυροῦ ἡ ἰσχὺς .... διὰ τούτου πάντα τελεῖται· βάπτισμα διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.... χειροτονία διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.* Ed.]

for the former unction and consignation preceding baptism. There was no unction before baptism in the time of Tertullian; but there was one immediately after it, which, together with imposition of hands, had also the sign of the cross joined with it; and all these were properly ceremonies of confirmation, which came after baptism, and are not to be confounded with the former. Tertullian [89] says, 'The flesh is washed, that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed, that the soul may be guarded; the flesh is overshadowed by imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh is fed by the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may receive nourishment or fatness from God.' Here he describes all things in order, as they were done after baptism to the eucharist. There was an unction and a signing with the sign of the cross, and imposition of hands, and then the eucharist. So that this sign of the cross plainly relates to the unction which came after baptism, and was an usual ceremony of imposition of hands or confirmation. And thus we are to understand that other passage of Tertullian [90], where he says, 'The Devil apes the ceremonies of the divine sacraments in his idol-mysteries; he baptizes those that believe in him; he promises them expiation of sins in his laver, as now it is in the mysteries of Mithra; he signs his soldiers in the forehead; he celebrates also the oblation of bread, &c.' Where most probably *signing in the forehead* relates to the sign of the cross in confirmation, which comes between baptism and the eucharist. And so in Pope Leo [91]: 'All that are regenerated in Christ, the sign of the cross makes them kings, and the unction of the Spirit consecrates them priests;' meaning in the same sense as St. Peter

[89] De Resurrect. c. 8. (p. 330 c.) Scilicet caro abluitur, ut anima emaculetur. Caro unguitur, ut anima consecretur. Caro signatur, ut et anima muniatur. Caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur. Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.

[90] De Præscript. c. 40. (p. 216 d.) .... Ipsas quoque res sacramentorum divinorum in idolorum mysteriis æmulatur. Tingit et ipse quosdam, utique credentes et fideles suos. Expositionem [al. expiationem] de lavacro repromittit, et, si adhuc memini Mithræ, signat illic in frontibus milites suos, celebrat et panis oblationem. [al. et sic adhuc initiat Mithræ. Signat illic, &c.]

[91] Serm. 3. [al. 4. c. 1.] in Anniversario Diei suæ Assumptionis, p. 3. (Oper. Leon. t. 1. p. 15.) Omnes in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit reges; Sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes.

says, "All Christians are a royal priesthood." [1 Pet. 2, 9.] Which privileges are commonly by the Ancients ascribed to the unction in confirmation, as here by Leo, who makes the sign of the cross an attendant of this unction after baptism.

St. Austin's words[92] are a little more general; but yet learned men[93] think they refer to the sign of the cross in confirmation, when he says, 'Several sacraments or sacred rites are received in different ways; some, you know, are received in the mouth, (meaning the eucharist;) others in the whole body, (meaning baptism, wherein the whole body is washed with water;) others in the forehead, as the sign of the cross.' Where, because he distinguishes the sign of the cross, as a sacrament in the large sense of the word, both from baptism and the eucharist, it seems most reasonable to suppose that he intended the use of it in confirmation: which therefore the Greeks[94] often call *σφραγὶς, the sign or seal of the Holy Ghost.* And sometimes the sign of the cross is more distinctly called *σταυροειδὴς σφραγὶς, the sign made in the form of the cross,* which was used not only in baptizing and confirming, but also in the ordination of priests, as I have had occasion elsewhere[95] to show out of Chrysostom and Dionysius, and in the consecration of the waters of baptism, which is the next thing that comes now in order to be considered.

CHAP. X.

Of the consecration of the water in baptism.

The consecration of the water made by prayer.

1. Immediately after the unction the minister proceeded to consecrate the water, or the bishop if he were present consecrated it, while the priests were finishing the unction. For so

[92] Enarrat. in Ps. 141. p. 671. (t. 4. p. 1583 e.) Multa sacramenta aliter atque aliter accipimus. Quædam, sicut nostis, ore accipimus, quædam per totum corpus accipimus. Quia vero in fronte erubescitur,. . . crucem Christi [al. ipsam ignominiam quodammodo, et] quam pagani derident, in loco pudoris nostri constituit.

[93] De Confirmat. l. 2. c. 24. (p. 224. corrige p. 294.) Neque hic omittendus est alius quidam Augustini locus, ex quo id ipsum, quod ex Prudentio supra observavimus, discimus, in fronte fieri illo ævo solitam chrismationem. *Multa sacramenta, &c.*—See the preceding note.

[94] C. Gen. Constant. 1. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 b.) . . . . Καὶ σφραγιζομένους, ἤτοι χριομένους πρῶτον τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ τό τε μέτωπον, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὰ ὦτα· καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν, Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

[95] B. 4. ch. 6. s. 12. v. 2. p. 89. nn. 49, 50, 54.

the author under the name of Dionysius represents it. 'While the priests,' says he[96], 'are finishing the unction, the bishop comes to the mother of adoption,' (so he calls the font,) 'and by invocation sanctifies the water in it, thrice pouring in some of the holy chrism in a manner representing the sign of the cross.' This invocation or consecration of the water by prayer, is mentioned by Tertullian. For he says[97], 'The waters are made the sacrament of sanctification by invocation of God. The Spirit immediately descends from heaven, and resting upon them sanctifies them by himself, and they, being so sanctified, imbibe the power of sanctifying.' And Cyprian declares[98], 'that the water must first be cleansed and sanctified by the priest, that it may have power by baptism to wash away the sins of man.' And so the whole Council of Carthage[99], in the time of Cyprian, says, 'the water is sanctified by the prayer of the priest, to wash away sin.' Optatus has respect to this, when speaking of the name of *PISCIS*, ΙΧΘΥΣ, the technical name that was given to Christ from the several initial letters of his titles, which signifies *a fish*, he says[1], 'This is the fish (meaning Christ) which is brought down upon the waters of the font in baptism by invocation and prayer.' St. Austin often mentions this invocation in his books of Baptism[2]: 'That water is not profane and adulterated, over which the name of God is invoked, though the invocation be made by profane and adulterous men.' In another place[3] he says, 'This invocation was used both in consecrating the waters of

[96] See n. 79, preceding.

[97] De Bapt. c. 4. (p. 225 c.)... Sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificandi combibunt.

[98] Ep. 70. ad Januar. p. 190. (p. 300.) Oportet vero mundari et sanctificari aquam prius a sacerdote, ut possit baptismo suo peccata hominis, qui baptizatur, abluere.

[99] Ap. Cypr. n. 18. p. 233. (p. 161.) .... Aqua sacerdotis prece in ecclesia sanctificata abluit delicta.

[1] L. 3. cont. Parmenian. p. 62. (p. 61.) Hic est PISCIS, qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur.

[2] L. 3. c. 10. (t. 9. p. 113 a.) Non est autem aqua profana et adultera, super quam nomen Dei invocatur, etiam si a profanis et adulteris invocetur.

[3] L. 5. c. 20. (p. 154 g. and 155 a.) Si ergo ad hoc valet, quod dictum est in evangelio, *Deus peccatorem non audit*, ut per peccatorem sacramenta non celebrentur; quomodo exaudit homicidam deprecantem, vel super aquam baptismi vel super oleum, vel super eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum, quibus manus imponitur? Quæ omnia tamen et fiunt et valent etiam per homicidas, &c.

baptism, and the oil for unction, and the eucharist, and in giving imposition of hands. And the sacraments were valid, though it were a sinner or a murderer that made the prayer.' And again, answering the objection of the Cyprianists and Donatists, 'that a wicked man or an heretic could not sanctify the water,' he says [4], 'Every error in the prayer of consecration does not destroy the essence of baptism, but only the want of those evangelical words,' (he means the form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity instituted by Christ, without which baptism cannot be consecrated,) 'for otherwise, if the water were not consecrated, when the minister uses any erroneous words in his prayer, then not only wicked men, but many good brethren in the Church did not sanctify the water: for many of their prayers were daily corrected, when they were rehearsed to those that were more learned, and many errors were found in them contrary to the Catholic faith.' Yet they that were baptized, when such prayers were said over the water, were not baptized again.

This is a plain evidence that prayers of consecration were then generally used both among the Catholics and Donatists, though neither the use nor the orthodoxy of them were reckoned to be of absolute necessity to the very being and essence of baptism, which might consist with great errors in such prayers. It were easy to add many other testimonies of this ancient practice out of St. Ambrose [5], St. Basil [6], Theodoret [7],

[4] L. 6. c. 25. (p. 175 f, g.).... Quia si non sanctificatur aqua, cum aliqua erroris verba per imperitiam precator effundit, multi non solum mali, sed etiam boni fratres in ipsa ecclesia non sanctificant aquam. Multorum enim preces emendantur quotidie, si doctioribus fuerint recitatæ, et multa in eis reperiuntur contra catholicam fidem. Numquid si manifestarentur aliqui baptizati, [al. manifestetur aliquos baptizatos,] cum illæ preces dictæ super aquam fuissent, juberentur [al. jubebantur] denuo baptizari? .... Certa illa evangelica verba, sine quibus non potest baptismus consecrari, tantum valent, ut per illa sic evacuentur quæcunque in prece vitiosa contra regulam fidei dicuntur, quemadmodum dæmonium Christi nomine excluditur.

[5] De Sacrament. l. 1. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 353 c. n. 18.) Ubi primum ingreditur sacerdos, exorcismum facit, secundum [al. secundo] super creaturam aquæ invocationem, postea et precem defert, ut sanctificetur fons, et adsit præsentia Trinitatis æternæ. —De Spirit. Sanct. l. 1. c. 7. (ibid. p. 618 e. n. 88.) Habes etiam in evangelio, quia angelus secundum tempus descendebat in natatoriam, et movebatur aqua, et, qui prior descendisset in natatoriam, sanus fiebat. Quid in hoc typo angelus nisi descensionem Sancti Spiritus nuntiabat, quæ nostris futura temporibus aquas, sacerdotalibus invocata precibus, consecraret.

Gregory Nyssen[8], Theophilus of Alexandria[9], Victor Uticensis[10], and some others[11]. But I think it needless to repeat them all at length, after such full evidence from St. Austin and those writers that came before him.

2. Only I shall add two or three observations more concerning this prayer of consecration, which may give a little light to some usages and some doctrines also of the ancient Church. And first we find, that as they had forms for other parts of the divine service, so they had a form for this consecration-prayer, or benediction of the water; though that not so universal and invariable as the form of baptism. For St. Austin observes, 'that the one never varied, but the other was subject to some errors and corruptions, by reason of the liberty that was left to human composers.'

An ancient form of this prayer in the Constitutions.

One of these forms is now exstant in the Constitutions[12],

[6] In Ps. 28. [Grischovius has passed over this citation as indistinct. Perhaps the author had in mind the words (t. 1. part. 1. p. 167 a. n. 3.) referring to the Baptism of our Lord,—Τότε γὰρ ὁ Κύριος μὲν ἦν ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, ἁγιάζων τὰ ὕδατα διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος κ. τ. λ. Ed.]—De Spir. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 76 a. n. 66.) Εὐλογοῦμεν τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ βαπτίσματος.

[7] In 1 Cor. 6, 11. t. 3. p. 144. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 196.) Τῇ γὰρ ἐπικλήσει τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ἁγιάζεται τῶν ὑδάτων ἡ φύσις, καὶ χορηγεῖται τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἡ ἄφεσις.

[8] De Bapt. Christi. (t. 3. p. 371 a.) Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν λογισμῶν καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, οὐδὲν ἄλλο τυγχάνον ἢ ὕδωρ, ἀνακαινίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν νοητὴν ἀναγέννησιν, τῆς ἄνωθεν χάριτος εὐλογούσης αὐτό. —Id. adversus eos, qui Bapt. differunt. (t. 2. p. 219 b.) Λογισάμενος δὲ σωφρόνως, ὅτι πᾶς τόπος τοῦ κοινοῦ Δεσπότου, καὶ πᾶν ὕδωρ ἐπιτήδειον εἰς τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρείαν, μόνον ἐὰν εὕρῃ πίστιν τοῦ λαμβάνοντος, καὶ εὐλογίαν τοῦ ἁγιάζοντος ἱερέως.

[9] Ep. Paschal. 1. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 3. p. 87. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 627 b.) .... Dicit enim Spiritum Sanctum non operari ea, quæ in anima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod asserens non recogitat, aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari.

[10] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 2. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 7. p. 602. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. pp. 679 f. seqq. vel p. 683 g.) Pergit comitante officio clericorum ad fontem: ubi fixis genibus cum ingenti gemitu, pulsans singultibus cœlum, crispantem benedixit alveum fontis, et, cum completa surrexisset oratione, &c.

[11] Vid. Gelas. Cyzicen. Hist. C. Nicæn. l. 2. c. 30. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος. (CC. t. 2. p. 231 b.) Ἐν γὰρ πίστει τοῦ βαπτίζοντος, καὶ ἐν πίστει τοῦ βαπτιζομένου, διὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐπικλήσεως, πλήρη τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ Θείου πυρὸς νόει τὰ ὕδατα, κ. τ. λ.—Pseudo-Athanas. de Communi Essentia &c., n. 40. (int. Dubia, t. 2. part. 1. p. 17 a. 7.) Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἱερεὺς οὐ τὸ ὕδωρ ἁγιάζει, ἀλλὰ τὴν δέουσαν ὑπηρεσίαν ἀποπληροῖ, εἰληφὼς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ χάριν. Ed.]

[12] L. vii. c. 43. [Labb. c. 44.] Περὶ τοῦ μυστικοῦ ὕδατος εὐχαριστία (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.) .... Εὐλογεῖ καὶ δοξάζει τὸν δεσπότην Θεὸν, τὸν παντοκράτορα, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ μονογενοῦς Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστῶν ὁ ἱερεὺς, ὅτι ἀπέστειλεν ἐνανθρωπῆσαι τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ· ὅτι ἠνέσχετο

which it will not be amiss here to insert: it goes under the title of *A Thanksgiving over the Mystical Water.* The priest blesses and praises the Lord God Almighty, the Father of the only-begotten God, giving him thanks for that he sent his Son to be incarnate for us, that he might save us; that he took upon him in his incarnation to be obedient in all things, to preach the kingdom of heaven, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the dead. After this he adores the only-begotten God, and for him gives thanks to the Father, that he took upon him to die for all men upon the cross, leaving the baptism of regeneration as a type or symbol of it. He further praises God, the Lord of all, that in the name of Christ and by the Holy Spirit, not rejecting mankind, he showed himself at divers times in divers providences towards them; giving Adam an habitation in a delicious paradise; then laying upon him a command in his providence, upon the transgression of which he expelled him in his justice, but in his goodness did not wholly cast him off, but disciplined his posterity in divers manners; for whom in the end of the world he sent his Son, to be made man for the sake of men, and to take upon him all the affections of men, sin only excepted. After this thanksgiving the priest is to call upon God, and say, 'Look down from heaven, and sanctify this water; give it grace and power, that he that is baptized therein, according to the command of Christ, may be crucified with him, and die with him, and be buried with him, and rise again with him to that adoption

τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ὑπήκοον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἐν πᾶσι, κηρύξαι βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. Ἐπὶ τούτοις προσκυνεῖ αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν μετ' αὐτὸν, καὶ δι' αὐτὸν εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ, τῷ ἀναδέξασθαι αὐτὸν τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων θάνατον διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, οὗ τύπον ἔδωκε τὸ βάπτισμα τῆς παλιγγενεσίας· δοξάζει τε, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ Θεὸς, ὁ τῶν ὅλων Κύριος, ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι οὐκ ἀπέρριψε τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· ἀλλὰ διαφόροις καιροῖς διαφόρους προνοίας ἐποιήσατο· τότε Ἀδὰμ αὐτῷ ἐν παραδείσῳ, πρῶτον μὲν τρυφῆς λόγῳ τὸν παράδεισον οἰκητήριον δούς· ἔπειτα προνοίας λόγῳ ἐντολὴν ποιησάμενος· ἁμαρτόντα δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐξώσας· ἀγαθότητι δὲ μὴ ἀπορρίψας εἰς τὸ παντελὲς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ διαδοχὴν διαφόρως παιδεύσας· δι' ὃν ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπέστειλε τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, ἄνθρωπον γενέσθαι δι' ἀνθρώπους, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πάθη ἀναδέξασθαι χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· αὐτὸν οὖν καὶ νῦν παρακαλείτω ὁ ἱερεὺς πρὸς τῷ βαπτίσματι· καὶ λεγέτω ὅτι· Κάτιδε ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο· δὸς δὲ χάριν καὶ δύναμιν, ὥστε τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, αὐτῷ συσταυρωθῆναι, καὶ συναποθανεῖν, καὶ συνταφῆναι, καὶ συναναστῆναι εἰς υἱοθεσίαν, τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ, τῷ νεκρωθῆναι μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῆσαι δὲ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.

which comes by him; that dying unto sin, he may live unto righteousness.'

Any one that will compare the form in our Liturgy with this ancient form, will find a great resemblance between them, both in the thanksgiving and the particular prayer of consecration.

3. Secondly, I observe, that together with this prayer it was usual to make the sign of the cross also, not as before, upon the person to be baptized, but as a circumstance of the consecration. This we learn not only from Dionysius[13], but from St. Austin[14], who says, 'the water of baptism was signed with the cross of Christ.' And St. Chrysostom[15] says, 'they used it in all their sacred mysteries; when they were regenerated in baptism, when they were fed with the mystical food in the eucharist, when they were ordained, that symbol of victory was always represented in the action, whatever religious matter they were concerned in.' To which we may add the author under the name of St. Austin[16], who runs over all the solemn consecrations of the Church, and tells us, 'the symbol of the cross was used in every one; in catechizing new converts, in consecrating the waters of baptism, in giving imposition of hands in confirmation, in the dedication of churches

The sign of the cross used in this consecration.

[13] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. p. 254. See before, ch. 9. s. 5. p. 162., the latter part of n. 79.

[14] Hom. 27. ex 50. t. 10. p. 175. [al. Serm. 352.] (t. 5. p. 1364 e.) Quia baptismus, id est, salutis aqua, non est salutis, nisi Christi nomine consecrata, qui pro nobis sanguinem fudit, cruce ipsius aqua signatur.

[15] Hom. 54. al. 55. in Matth. p. 475. (t. 7. p. 551 b.) . . . Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τελεῖται τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς· κἂν ἀναγεννηθῆναι δέῃ, σταυρὸς παραγίνεται· κἂν τραφῆναι τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην τροφήν· κἂν χειροτονηθῆναι, κ. τ. λ.

[16] Hom. 75. de Diversis, in append. t. 10. p. 702. [Cited according to the Ed. Paris. 1637., which the Author consulted. This is by the Benedictine Editor, Paris. 1689–1700, termed *Olim* 19. *de Sanctis, et post in appendice* 75, and forms Serm. 247. of the appendix of that edition, (t. 5. append. p. 407 f. c. 7.) Hoc signo dæmones fugantur, hoc antidoto sanitates perficiuntur. Hoc signum præsidium est amicis, obstaculum inimicis. Hujus crucis mysterio rudes catechizantur, eodem mysterio fons regenerationis consecratur, ejusdem crucis signo per manus impositionem baptizati dona gratiarum accipiunt. Cum ejusdem crucis charactere basilicæ dedicantur, altaria consecrantur, altaris sacramenta cum interpositione dominicorum verborum conficiuntur. Sacerdotes et Levitæ per hoc idem ad sacros ordines promoventur.—[I give the entire passage, which, owing to the indistinctness of the reference, former editors have failed to verify; as they have done in several similar instances. It is, however, entirely spurious: of which the Benedictine Editor (ibid. n. in Titul.) says, *In Germanensi veteri Codice exstat inter Sermones Ivonis Carnotensis, cujus etiam nomine pridem vulgatus est.* Ed.]

and altars, in consecrating the eucharist, and in promoting priests and Levites to holy orders.'

The effects and change wrought by this consecration the same as in the bread and wine in the eucharist.

4. Thirdly, I observe concerning the effects of this consecration, that the very same change was supposed to be wrought by it in the waters of baptism, as by the consecration of bread and wine in the eucharist. For they supposed not only the presence of the Spirit, but also the mystical presence of Christ's blood, to be here after consecration. Julius Firmicus[17], speaking of baptism, bids men here 'seek for the pure waters, the undefiled fountain, where the blood of Christ, after many spots and defilements, would whiten them by the Holy Ghost.' Gregory Nazianzen[18] and Basil[19] say upon this account, 'that a greater than the temple, a greater than Solomon, a greater than Jonas, is here,' meaning Christ by his mystical presence and the power of his blood. St. Austin[20] says 'Baptism (or baptismal water) is red, when once it is consecrated by the blood of Christ; and this was prefigured by the waters of the Red Sea.' Prosper[21] is bold to say, 'that in baptism we are dipped in blood, and therefore martyrs are twice dipped in blood; first in the blood of Christ at baptism, and then in their own blood at martyrdom.' St. Jerom[22] uses the same bold metaphor, explaining those words of Isaiah, "Wash ye, make ye clean," [1, 16.] 'Be ye baptized in my blood by the laver of regeneration.' And again[23], speaking of the Ethiopian eunuch, he says, 'he was baptized in the blood of Christ, about whom he was reading.' After the same manner Cæsarius[24]

[17] De Error. Profan. Relig. c. 28. (ap. Galland. t. 5. p. 36 d.) Quære fontes ingenuos, quære puros liquores, ut illic te post multas maculas cum Spiritu Sancto Christi sanguis incandidet.

[18] Orat. 11. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 657 b.) .... Ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶντος ὧδε, παρὰ τοῖς τελείως λογιζομένοις.

[19] De Bapt. l. 1. c. 2. t. 1. p. 588. (t. 2. part. 2. append. p. 898 b. n. 4.) .... Μεῖζον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὧδε· ... μεῖζον τοῦ Σολομῶντος ὧδε· καὶ μεῖζον τοῦ Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

[20] Tract. 11. in Ioan. p. 41. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 377 b.) Significabat mare illud rubrum baptismum Christi. Unde rubet baptismus Christi, nisi Christi sanguine consecratus?

[21] De Promissis. part. 2. c. 2. (append. p. 125 e. 7.) In cocco bis tincto martyria sancta rutilant, semel baptismo Christi sanguine tinguntur, atque suo effusionis cruore denuo retincti.

[22] In Esai. 1, 16. (t. 4. p. 22 c.) .... Baptizemini in sanguine meo per lavacrum regenerationis.

[23] In Esai. 53, 7. (ibid. p. 617 d.) .... Statim baptizatus in Agni sanguine, quem legebat, vir meruit appellari, et apostolus genti Æthiopum missus est.

[24] Hom. 6. de Paschat. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 2. p. 276. Ingreditur anima vitales undas velut rubras sanguine Christi consecratas. [So the Author cites this passage. But in the *Bi-*

says, 'The soul goes into the living waters, consecrated and made red by the blood of Christ.' And Isidore[25] says, 'What is the Red Sea but baptism consecrated in the blood of Christ?' Others tell us, 'that we are hereby made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and eat his flesh,' according to what is said in St. John's Gospel, [6, 53.] "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Upon which words Fulgentius[26] founds the necessity of baptism, 'forasmuch as it may be perceived by any considering man, that the flesh of Christ is eaten and his blood drunk in the laver of regeneration.' Hence Cyril of Alexandria[27] says 'we are partakers of the spiritual lamb in baptism:' and Chrysostom[28], 'that we thereby put on Christ, not only his divinity, or only his humanity, that is, his flesh, but both together.' And Nazianzen[29], 'that in baptism we are anointed and protected by the precious blood of Christ, as Israel was by the blood upon the door-posts in the night.' St. Chrysostom[30] says again, 'that they that are baptized put on a royal garment, a purple dipped in the blood of the Lord.' Philo Carpathius[31] says, 'the spouse of Christ, his Church, receives

bliotheca Patrum, Paris. 1624, (t. 2. p. 276 a. 7.) and in the *Bibliotheca Maxima, Lugdun.* 1677, (t. 8. p. 824 d.) the passage reads thus: Pereuntibus sacro in fonte peccatis, tanquam in rubras Ægyptii demerguntur undas. Rubras, id est Christi sanguine consecratas. Ed.]

[25] In Exod. 19. (p. 308 e.) Quid est mare rubrum, nisi baptismum Christi sanguine consecratum?

[26] De Bapt. Æthiop. c. 11. p. 611. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 177 d.) .... Quisquis .... secundum mysterii veritatem considerare poterit, in ipso lavacro sanctæ regenerationis hoc fieri providebit.—Ibid. (g. 1.) Quod etiam sanctos patres indubitanter credidisse ac docuisse cognoscimus.

[27] In Exod. 12. l. 2. (t. 1. p. 270 b.) .... *Μέτοχος ἥδε τοῦ νοητοῦ προβάτου, κ. τ. λ.*

[28] Serm. 27. de Cruce, t. 6. p. 293. (t. 2. int. Spur. p. 823 a.) ... *Ἄκουε Παύλου λέγοντος· Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε· Χριστὸν δὲ ὅταν ἀκούσῃς, μὴ τὸν Θεὸν λογίσῃ μόνον, μηδὲ τὴν ἔνσαρκον οἰκονομίαν μόνην, ἀλλὰ τὸ συναμφότερον.*

[29] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 646 b.) *Εἰ δὲ προκαταλάβοις σεαυτὸν τῇ σφραγῖδι, καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἀσφαλίσαιο τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν βοηθημάτων καὶ στερροτάτῳ, σημειωθεὶς καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα, τῷ χρίσματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὡς Ἰσραὴλ πάλαι τῷ νυκτερινῷ καὶ φυλακτικῷ τῶν πρωτοτόκων αἵματι καὶ χρίσματι, τί σοι συμβήσεται;*

[30] Hom. 60. ad Illuminand. t. 1. p. 796. (t. 2. [ad Illuminand. Catech. 1.] p. 226 c.) .... *Ὅταν τὸ ἱμάτιον τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀπολάβητε, ὅταν τὴν πορφύραν περιβάλησθε τὴν αἵματι βαφεῖσαν δεσποτικῷ.*

[31] In Cantic. 4, 12. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 5. p. 677 f. 12.) Fons quoque signatus eadem sponsa dicitur, quia in baptismate signaculum Jesu Christi accepit, ex ejus sacratissimi sanguinis fonte perlota. [Conf. ap. Galland. (t. 9. p. 748 a.) ... Christi signo, quod in lavacro regenerationis imprimitur. Ed.]

in baptism the seal of Christ, being washed in the fountain of his most holy blood.' Optatus, as we have heard before[32], says, 'Christ comes down by the invocation, and joins himself to the waters of baptism.' Nay, Chrysostom[33], in one of his bold rhetorical flights, scruples not to tell a man that is baptized, 'that he immediately embraces his Lord in his arms, that he is united to his body, nay, compounded or consubstantiated with that body which sits above, whither the Devil has no access.' Some tell us, as Isidore[34], 'that the water of baptism is the water that flowed out of Christ's side at his passion:' and others, as Laurentius Novariensis[35], 'that it is water mixed with the sacred blood of the Son of God.'

Others[36] tell us, 'that the water is transmuted or changed in its nature by the Holy Ghost, to a sort of divine and ineffable power.' So Cyril of Alexandria, who frequently uses the word *μεταστοιχείωσις*, *transelementation*[37], both when he speaks of the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the eucharist, or of any other changes that are wrought in the mysteries of the Christian religion. Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory Nyssen have the same observation upon the change that is wrought in the oil, after consecration, which they make to be the same with that of the bread and wine in the eucharist. 'Beware,' says Cyril[38], 'that you take not this oint-

[32] L. 3. See s. 1. n. 1, preceding.

[33] Hom. 6. in Col. p. 1359. (t. 11. p. 370 c.) *Οὐ ξύλον ὁρᾷς, οὐδὲ πηγὴν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸν εὐθέως περιλαμβάνεις τὸν Δεσπότην, ἀνακεράννυσαι τῷ σώματι, ἀναφήρῃ,* [leg. *ἀναφύρῃ*] *τῷ σώματι τῷ ἄνω κειμένῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

[34] De Offic. Eccles. l. 2. c. 24. (p. 411 d.) Baptismum autem aqua est, quæ tempore passionis Christi de latere profluxit.

[35] Hom. 1. de Pœnitent. (ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 2. p. 127 b. 2.) Asperges me aqua Filii tui sacro sanguine mixta. . . . . Abluitur Adam corpore Christi, &c.

[36] Cyril. Alexandr. in Ioan. 3, 5. (t. 4. p. 147 d.) . . . *Διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τινὰ καὶ ἄρρητον ἀναστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν.*—Vide Albertinum de Eucharistia, l. 2., (p. 481.) where he has collected all the passages that speak of this transelementation.

[37] [Vid. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. (t. 2. p. 362.) Vix obiter harum vocum [*μεταστοιχειόω* et *μεταστοιχείωσις*] meminerunt lexicographi, quamvis earum usus apud scriptores ecclesiasticos sit frequens, at eas mutationes exprimendas spirituales, quæ substantiarum et formarum inter se transmutationes minime denotant.—Vid. exempla plurima ibid. nn. 1, 2, 3. Ed.]

[38] Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 3. (p. 316 d.) *Ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν, μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον.*

ment to be bare ointment: for as the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ; so this holy ointment after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is a gift of God, that makes Christ and the Holy Spirit to be present in the action.' In like manner Gregory Nyssen[38] makes the same change to be in the mystical oil, and in the altar itself, and in the ministers by ordination, and in the waters of baptism, as in the bread and wine in the eucharist after consecration. 'Do not contemn,' says he, 'the divine laver, nor despise it as a common thing, because of the use of water; for great and wonderful things are wrought by it. This altar, before which we stand, is but common stone in its own nature, differing nothing from other stones, wherewith our walls are built; but after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, it is an holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread also is at first but common bread, but when once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so the wine, though they be things of little value before the benediction, yet after their sanctification by the Spirit they both work wonders. The same power of the word makes a priest become honourable and venerable, when he is separated from the community of the vulgar by a new benediction. For he,

[38] De Bapt. Christ. (t. 3. p. 369 d. seqq.) *Μὴ καταφρονήσῃς τοῦ θείου λουτροῦ, μηδὲ ὡς κοινὸν αὐτὸ ἐξευτελίσῃς, διὰ τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ ὕδατος· τὸ γὰρ ἐνεργοῦν μέγα, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου θαυμαστὰ γίνεται τὰ τελούμενα. Ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον, ᾧ παρεστήκαμεν, λίθος ἐστι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν κοινὸς, οὐδὲν διαφέρων τῶν ἄλλων πλακῶν, αἳ τοὺς τοίχους ἡμῶν οἰκοδομοῦσι, καὶ καλλωπίζουσι τὰ ἐδάφη· ἐπειδὰν δὲ καθιερώθῃ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ, καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐδέξατο, ἔστι τράπεζα ἁγία, θυσιαστήριον ἄχραντον, οὐκέτι παρὰ πάντων ψηλαφώμενον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν ἱερέων, καὶ τούτων εὐλαβομένων· ὁ ἄρτος πάλιν ἄρτός ἐστι τέως κοινός· ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεταί τε καὶ γίνεται· οὕτως τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος, ὀλίγου τινὸς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸ τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖ διαφόρως. Ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ποιεῖ σεμνὸν καὶ τίμιον, τῇ καινότητι τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς κοινότητος χωριζόμενον· χθὲς γὰρ καὶ πρώην εἷς ὑπάρχων τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἀθρόου ἀποδείκνυται καθηγεμὼν, πρόεδρος, διδάσκαλος εὐσεβείας, μυστηρίων λανθανόντων μυσταγωγός· καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ, μηδὲν τοῦ σώματος ἢ τῆς μορφῆς ἀμειφθείς· ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐκεῖνος, ὅς ἦν, ἀοράτῳ τινὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τὴν ἀόρατον ψυχὴν μεταμορφωθεὶς πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον.*

who before was only one of the common people, is now immediately made a ruler and a president, a teacher of piety and a minister of the secret mysteries: and all these things he does without any change in his body or shape; for to all outward appearance he is the same that he was, but the change is in his invisible soul by an invisible power and grace.' Pope Leo[39] goes one step further, and tells us, 'that baptism makes a change not only in the water, but in the man that receives it, for thereby Christ receives him, and he receives Christ, and he is not the same after baptism that he was before, but the body of him that is regenerated is made the flesh of him that was crucified.'

From all which it is easy to observe, that in all these cases, the change which they speak of is not made in the substance of the things, but in the qualities only; the water is not the blood of Christ substantially and really, but only symbolically and mystically: nor is a man changed into the flesh of Christ thereby any other way, than as he is made a living member of his mystical body, participating of that Spirit whereby he rules and governs his church, as the head of it. So that when the Ancients speak of a divine change or *transelementation*[40] (for as yet the word *transubstantiation* was not known) in the bread and wine in the eucharist, they are to be interpreted, as here we do in baptism, of a change in qualities and powers.

[39] Serm. 14. [juxt. Ed. Ballerin. 12. al. 63.] de Passione, c. 6. p. 62. (t. 1. p. 246.) .... Susceptus a Christo, Christumque suscipiens, non idem est post lavacrum, qui ante baptismum fuit, sed corpus regenerati fit caro crucifixi.

[40] [Conf. Suicer. ubi supr. n. 4. (p. 364.) De aqua baptismi... Patres dicunt eam μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι in virtutem divinam, quam satis constat non transubstantiari. Ergo cum de sacramentis Dominici corporis et sanguinis idem verbum usurpant, non aliter debent intelligi, nec ullo id modo potest de substantiæ in substantiam mutatione accipi..... Nyssenus cum dicit (in Orat. Catechet. de Sacrament.) φύσιν panis et vini μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι in corpus et sanguinem Christi, substantiam quidem intelligit μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι, id est, adjectione gratiæ in alium habitum et usum transmutari, manente nimirum eadem substantia, quæ μεταστοιχειοῦται, non vero μετουσιοῦται. Nam μεταστοιχειοῦν nihil minus significat, quam substantiam convertere. Errant ergo, qui verbum hoc Græcum *transelementare* reddunt: non enim ex nomine στοιχεῖον, quod est elementum, sed ex simplici verbo στοιχειοῦν, addita præpositione, fit, &c.—Suicer goes on to shew the proper meaning of the simple verb, and then to exemplify the true force of the compound, concluding thus: Res etiam ipsæ μεταστοιχειοῦνται, quæ naturam suam et substantiam suam non exuunt nec mutant, sed habitum, usum, modulum, &c. Ed.]

and not in substance: since all the words they used to express that change, are equally verified in the waters of baptism after consecration.

5. I must further observe, to avoid all mistakes, that when the Ancients speak of an absolute necessity of invocation of God to consecrate the waters of baptism, they then do not mean any new forms of prayer instituted by the Church, but the very form of baptism instituted by Christ, which they rightly suppose to be an invocation of the Holy Trinity: in which sense, no baptism can be duly performed without an invocation to consecrate the water, though it may be performed in times of exigency, without the additional prayers of the Church[40].

How far these prayers of consecration were reckoned necessary in the Church.

CHAP. XI.

Of the different ways of baptizing by immersion, trine immersion, and aspersion in the case of clinic baptism.

1. Having thus far considered all things preceding the very act of baptizing, we are now to inquire into the manner how that was usually performed, whether by dipping and total immersion, or by aspersion and sprinkling, which is now the more general practice of the Church. There is no question made, but that either of these ways does fully answer the primary end of baptism, which is to purify the soul and not the body, by washing away sin. But yet the Ancients thought, that immersion, or burying under water, did more lively represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ, as well as our own death unto sin, and rising again to righteousness: and the divesting or unclothing the person to be baptized, did also represent the putting off the body of sin in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. For which reason they observed the way of baptizing all persons naked and divested, by a total immersion under

All persons anciently divested in order to be baptized.

[40] Vid. Albertin. de Eucharist. l. 1. (p. 18. ad sinistr. sub med.) Respexisse autem veteres ad hæc evangelica verba, In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, dubium esse non potest, cum nullæ sint aliæ preces ad aquæ consecrationem a Domino institutæ. Ad hanc generalem implicitamque invocationem, in primæva evangelii simplicitate, aquæ sanctificationi hominisque sanctificationi abunde sufficientem, amplificarunt et dilatarunt, preces primo concipientes pro aquæ sanctificatione, deinde etiam alias pro baptismum suscipiente, cum variis additamentis exoticorum rituum.

water, except in some particular cases of great exigency, wherein they allowed of sprinkling, as in the case of clinic baptism, or where there was a scarcity of water. That persons were divested in order to be baptized is evident, partly from what has been said before of the unction, which was administered not only on the head, but on other parts of the body; partly from express testimonies which affirm it; and also from the manner of baptizing by immersion, which necessarily presupposes it.

St. Chrysostom[41], speaking of baptism, says, 'Men were as naked as Adam in Paradise; but with this difference: Adam was naked because he had sinned, but in baptism a man was naked that he might be freed from sin: the one was divested of his glory, which he once had, but the other put off the old man, which he did as easily as his clothes.' St. Ambrose[42] says, 'Men came as naked to the font as they came into the world:' and thence he draws an argument by way of allusion to rich men, telling them, 'How absurd it was, that a man who was born naked of his mother, and received naked by the Church, should think of going rich into heaven.' Cyril of Jerusalem[43] takes notice of this circumstance, together with the reasons of it, when he thus addresses himself to persons newly baptized:

[41] Hom. 6. in Col. p. 1358. (t. 11. p. 369 d.) Ἐνταῦθα γυμνότης, κἀκεῖ γυμνότης· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ μὲν ἁμαρτήσας ἐγυμνώθη, ἐπειδὴ ἥμαρτεν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ, ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῇ, γυμνοῦται· ἀπεδύσατο τότε τὴν δόξαν, ἣν εἶχεν ἐκεῖνος· ἀποδύεται νῦν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον οὗτος, καὶ πρὶν ἢ ἐπιβῆναι, οὕτως εὐκόλως ἀποδύεται, ὥσπερ τὰ ἱμάτια.

[42] Serm. 10. [juxt. Ed. Basil. 1567. Serm. 20. in Ed. Paris. 1642. (t. 5. p. 153.) ap. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1686–90. deest. Vid. int. Oper. August. Serm. 88. append. t. 5. append. p. 158.] Nudi in sæculo nascimur, nudi etiam accedimus ad lavacrum.—Quam autem incongruum ac absurdum est, ut quem nudum mater genuit, nudum suscipit ecclesia, dives introire velit in cœlum?

[43] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. n. 2. (p. 311 b.) Εὐθὺς οὖν εἰσελθόντες ἀπεδύεσθε τὸν χιτῶνα· καὶ τοῦτο ἦν εἰκὼν τοῦ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποδύεσθαι σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν· ἀποδυθέντες γυμνοὶ ἦτε, μιμούμενοι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν ἐπὶ σταυροῦ γυμνωθέντα Χριστὸν, καὶ τῇ γυμνότητι ἀπεκδυσάμενον τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, καὶ μετὰ παρρησίας ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ θριαμβεύσαντα. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῖς μέλεσι τοῖς ὑμετέροις ἐνεφώλευον αἱ ἀντικείμεναι δυνάμεις, οὐκ ἔτι φορεῖν ὑμῖν ἔξεστι τὸν παλαιὸν ἐκεῖνον χιτῶνα· οὐ τοῦτον πάντως λέγω τὸν αἰσθητὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φθειρόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς ἀπάτης· ὃν μὴ εἴη πάλιν ἐνδύσασθαι τῇ ἅπαξ τοῦτον ἀποδυσαμένῃ ψυχῇ, ἀλλὰ λέγειν κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ Ἄσματι τῶν Ἀσμάτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ νύμφην, Ἐξεδυσάμην τὸν χιτῶνά μου, πῶς ἐνδύσομαι αὐτόν; Ὦ θαυμασίου πράγματος· γυμνοὶ ἦτε ἐν ὄψεσι πάντων, καὶ οὐκ ᾐσχύνεσθε· ἀληθῶς γὰρ μίμημα ἐφέρετε πρωτοπλάστου Ἀδὰμ, ὃς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ γυμνὸς ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ᾐσχύνετο.

'As soon as ye came into the inner part of the baptistery, ye put off your clothes, which is an emblem of putting off the old man with his deeds: and being thus divested ye stood naked, imitating Christ, that was naked upon the cross, who by his nakedness spoiled principalities and powers, publicly triumphing over them in the cross. O, wonderful thing! ye were naked in the sight of men, and were not ashamed; in this truly imitating the first man Adam, who was naked in Paradise, and was not ashamed.' So also Amphilochus, in the Life of St. Basil[44], speaking of his baptism, says, 'he arose with fear and put off his clothes, and with them the old man.' And Zeno Veronensis[45], reminding persons of their baptism, bids them rejoice, 'for they went down naked to the font, but rose again clothed in a white and heavenly garment, which if they did not defile they might obtain the kingdom of Heaven.' Athanasius, in his Invectives against the Arians[46], among other things lays this to their charge: 'that by their persuasions the Jews and Gentiles broke into the baptistery, and there offered such abuses to the catechumens, as they stood with their naked bodies, as was shameful and abominable to relate.' And a like complaint is brought against Peter bishop of Apamea, in the Council of Constantinople under Mennas[47], 'that he cast out the neophytes (or persons newly baptized) out of the baptistery, when they were without their clothes and shoes.'

[44] C. 5. [al. 4.] (p. 172 d.) Καὶ δὲ ἀναστὰς ἔντρομος ἐκδιδύσκεται τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀληθῶς τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον.

[45] Invitat. 2. ad Bapt. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 2. p. 442. (ap. Galland. Tract. 35. Invitat. ad Font. 6. t. 5. p. 149 b.) .... Gaudete: itaque in fontem quidem nudi demergitis [al. demergimini], sed, ætherea veste vestiti, mox candidati inde surgitis, quam qui non polluerit, regna cœlestia possidebit.

[46] Ep. ad Orthodox. t. 1. p. 946. [al. Ep. Encycl. ad Episc. n. 3.] (t. 1. part. 1. p. 90 b.) Εἰς δὲ τὸ ἅγιον βαπτιστήριον, φεῦ τῆς τόλμης, οἱ Κυριοκτόνοι Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οἱ ἄθεοι ἐθνικοὶ ἀφυλάκτως εἰσερχόμενοι, τοιαῦτα αἰσχρὰ διεπράττοντο καὶ ἐλάλουν γυμνοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς, ὡς αἰσχύνεσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτά. [This passage does not say *that the catechumens were naked*, though it seems to imply an insulting interruption to their privacy. See, however, Chrysost. Ep. ad Innocent., as cited in n. 47, overleaf. Ed.]

[47] Act. 1. juxt. Ed. Crabb. (t. 2. p. 53.) Cum essemus in baptisterio neophytistarum sine tunicis et calceamentis existentium, venit episcopus noster Petrus, et ejecit nos foras una cum neophytis, &c. [Conf. Concilii citati Act. 5. juxt. Ed. Labb. (t. 5. p. 230 d.) Stephanus et alter Stephanus presbyteri dixerunt: Cum essemus in baptisterio ad instruendos nuper baptizatos, qui sine tunicis et calceamentis erant, diaconis ipsos exorcizantibus, venit episcopus noster Petrus, et ejecit nos foras una cum nuper baptizatis, &c. Ed.]

All which are manifest proofs that persons were baptized naked, either in imitation of Adam in Paradise, or our Saviour upon the cross, or to signify their putting off the body of sin, and the old man with his deeds.

No exception in this case, either with respect to women or children.

2. And this practice was then so general, that we find no exception made, either with respect to the tenderness of infants, or the bashfulness of the female sex; save only where the case of sickness or disability made it necessary to vary from the usual custom. St. Chrysostom is an undeniable evidence in this matter. For writing about the barbarous proceedings of his enemies against him on the Great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, among other tragical things which they committed he reports[47] this for one: 'that they came armed into the church, and by violence expelled the clergy, killing many in the baptistery; with which the women, who at that time were divested in order to be baptized, were put into such a terror that they fled away naked, and could not stay in the fright to put on such clothes as the modesty of their sex required.' And that so it was in the case of children also, is evident from the custom of immersion which continued in the Church for many ages; as also from what is particularly said of infants in the Ordo Romanus[48] and Gregory's Sacramentarium[49], 'that after

[47] Ep. ad Innocent. p. 680. (t. 3. p. 518 e.) . . . . Ἀθρόον στρατιωτικὸν πλῆθος αὐτῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ, πρὸς ἑσπέρας λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιγινομένης, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπεισελθὸν, τὸν κλῆρον ἅπαντα τὸν σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς βίαν ἐξέβαλον, καὶ ὅπλοις τὸ βῆμα περιεστοίχιστο· καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων, πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα ἀποδυσάμεναι κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν, γυμναὶ ἔφυγον ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου τῆς χαλεπῆς ταύτης ἐφόδου· οὐδὲ τὴν πρέπουσαν γυναιξὶν εὐσχημοσύνην συγχωρούμεναι περιθέσθαι.

[48] Vid. cap. De Die Sabbati S. Paschæ. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 13. p. 697 c.) Cum vestiti fuerint infantes, pontifex confirmet eos.—Vid. Athanas. de Parabol. Evangel. quæst. 94. [al. 92.] See s. 4, the last part of n. 59, following.

[49] De Bapt. Infant. [juxt. Cod. Ratoldi Abbatis?] Baptizat eum sacerdos sub trina mersione, &c., et vestitur infans. [The exact words are not found in the place cited, according to the Benedictine edition, Paris. 1705. (t. 3. p. 73 b. 9 and d. 6.) Tunc baptizantur infantes . . . . . et sunt parati, qui eos suscepturi sunt, cum linteis in manibus eorum, et accipiunt ipsos a presbyteris, qui eos baptizant. Pontifex vero redit in sacrarium expectans, ut, cum vestiti fuerint infantes, confirmet eos. See Hugo Menard's note ad loc. n. 323. (ibid. p. 352 d. 12.) Hic autem et in editis est unica mersio. At in aliis codicibus nostris Mss. Remensi et Ratoldi . . . . . trina immersio, juxta priscum ecclesiæ morem, quem videre est in can. 50. Apostolorum et apud antiquos Patres, &c.—Porro (ibid. p. 353 e.) in trina mersione semel duntaxat forma proferebatur . . . . . sed ad singulas mersiones singulæ Personæ nominabantur, ut patet ex Codice Ratoldi Abbatis,—

the priest has baptized them with three immersions, they are to be clothed, and brought to the bishop to be confirmed.' For this clothing supposes that they were unclothed before in order to be baptized.

Yet matters were so ordered, as that no indecency might be committed.

3. But yet that no indecency might appear in so sacred an action, two things were especially provided for by ancient rules. First, that men and women were baptized apart. To which purpose the baptisteries were commonly divided into two apartments, the one for the men, the other for the women, as I have had occasion to show from St. Austin[50] in another place[51]. Or else the men were baptized at one time and the women at another, as Vossius[52] observes out of the Ordo Romanus, Gregory's Sacramentarium, Albinus Flaccus [or Alcuin], and other writers. Secondly, there was anciently an order of deaconesses in the Church, and one main part of their business was to assist at the baptism of women, where for decency's sake they were employed to divest them, and so to order the matter that the whole ceremony, both of unction and baptizing, might be performed in such a manner as became the reverence that was due to so sacred an action: of all which I have given sufficient proofs in a former Book[53], which I need not here repeat.

Deinde baptizat sacerdos sub trina mersione tantum Sanctum Trinitatem semel invocans, &c. The author probably cites the Sacramentary of Gregory with Hugo Menard's Notes. Paris. 1641. 4to. With this book I cannot meet; but I find the passage in Gregory's Liber Sacramentorum, as edited by Pamelius.—See Liturg. t. 2. p. 269. Ed.]

[50] De Civitat. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. t. 5. p. 1343. (t. 1. p. 665 f.) Admonetur in somnis, appropinquante Pascha, ut in parte fœminarum observanti ad baptisterium quæcunque illi baptizatæ primitus occurrisset, eundem locum signo Christi signaret.

[51] B. 8. ch. 7. s. 1. v. 3. p. 118. n. 32.

[52] De Bapt. disput. 1. thes. 8. pp. 35, 36. (t. 6. p. 258.) Alia ratione consulebatur muliebri verecundiæ. Nam viri separatim a fœminis baptizabantur... Ordo Romanus, cap. De Sabbato Sancto: *Deinde presbyteri, aut diaconi etiam, si necesse fuerit, et acolythi, induentes se vestibus mundis vel candidis, ingrediuntur in fontem intro in aquam; et baptizantur primum masculi, deinde fœminæ.*' Idem colligi potest ex Gregorii Magni Sacramentario: in quo *Ordo ad catechumenum faciendum* talis præscribitur: *Cum venerint ad ecclesiam, recitantur eorum nomina, et stent masculi ad dextram, fœminæ vero ad sinistram.* Postea oratio commemoratur; prius, quæ super masculos, exinde quæ super fœmellas, habetur. Similiter Albinus Flaccus, Lib. de Divinis Offic. cap. De Sabbato S. Paschæ: *Post horam denique tertiam, Sabbato præparantur ad ecclesiam qui baptizandi sunt, simul cum patrinis et matrinis, et ordinantur ab acolytho, masculi ad dexteram, fœminæ ad sinistram.*

[53] B. 2. ch. 22. s. 8. v. 1. p. 294, nn. 53—56.

Baptism usually performed by immersion.

4. Persons thus divested or unclothed were usually baptized by immersion or dipping of their whole bodies under water, to represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ together; and therewith to signify their own dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and their resurrection to a new life.

There are a great many passages in the Epistles of St. Paul, which plainly refer to this custom. Rom. 6, 4, "We are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." So again, Col. 2, 12, "Buried with him in baptism; wherein ye are also risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." And as this was the original Apostolical practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the Church for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the Apostles. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says[54], 'Baptism was given to represent the death of Christ, and the water his burial.' St. Chrysostom proves the resurrection from this practice: 'For,' says he[55], 'our being baptized and immerged in the water, and our rising again out of it, is a symbol of our descending into hell or the grave, and of our returning from thence. Wherefore St. Paul calls baptism our burial; for, says he, "we are buried with Christ by baptism into death."' And in another place[56], 'When we dip our heads in water as in a grave, *our old man is buried;* and when we rise up again, *the new man rises therewith.*' Cyril of Jerusalem[57] makes it an emblem of the Holy Ghost's effusion upon the Apostles: 'For as he, that goes down into the water and is baptized, is surrounded on all sides by the

[54] L. 3. c. 17. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 288.) Ἐστὶ τοίνυν τὸ μὲν βάπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διδόμενον, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς.

[55] Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 689. (t. 10. p. 379 c.) Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι, καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἶτα ἀνανεύειν, τῆς εἰς Ἅδου καταβάσεως ἐστὶ σύμβολον, καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀνόδου. Διὸ καὶ τάφον τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ Παῦλος καλεῖ λέγων, Συνετάφημεν. κ. τ. λ.

[56] In Ioan. 3, 5. Hom. 25. p. 656. [Ed. Bened. 24. al. 25.] (t. 8. p. 146 c.) Καθάπερ γὰρ ἔν τινι τάφῳ, τῷ ὕδατι καταδυόντων ἡμῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος θάπτεται, καὶ καταδὺς κάτω κρύπτεται ὅλος καθάπαξ· εἶτα, ἀνανευόντων ἡμῶν, ὁ καινὸς ἄνεισι πάλιν.

[57] Catech. 22. n. 8. p. 247. [al. Catech. 17. de Spir. Sanct. n. 14.] (p. 271 d.) Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἐνδύνων ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι καὶ βαπτιζόμενος πανταχόθεν ὑπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων περιβάλλεται, οὕτω καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐβαπτίσθησαν ὁλοτελῶς· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ ἔξωθεν περιχεῖται, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ἔνδοθεν ψυχὴν βαπτίζει ἀπαραλείπτως.

water; so the Apostles were baptized all over by the Spirit. The water surrounds the body externally, but the Spirit incomprehensibly baptizes the interior soul.' The fourth Council of Toledo[58] keeps to the former reason: 'The immersion in water is as it were the descending into the grave, and the rising out of the water a resurrection.' And so St. Ambrose[59] explains it: 'Thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? And thou didst answer, I believe: and then thou wast immerged in water, that is, buried.' It appears also from Epiphanius and others, that almost all heretics, who retained any baptism, retained immersion also. Epiphanius says[60], 'the Ebionites received baptism as it was practised in the Church, but they added to it a quotidian baptism, immerging themselves in water every day.' So the Marcionites were guilty of many errors in other respects about baptism: they would baptize no persons but either virgins[61], or widows, or unmarried men; they repeated their baptism three times[62], and introduced some other errors about it: but still the baptisms, which they administered, were in this respect conformable to those of the Church, that they baptized by a total immersion, as Tertullian[63] witnesses of them. Other heretics, as the Va-

[58] C. 6. (t. 5. p. 1707 a.) Nam in aquis mersio quasi ad infernum descensio est; et rursus ab aquis emersio resurrectio est.

[59] De Sacrament. l. 2. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 359 d. n. 20.) Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? dixisti, Credo, et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es.—Conf. Tertul. de Bapt. c. 2. (p. 224 b.)... Homo in aquam demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus, non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit.—Paulin. Ep. 12. ad Sever. (p. 144.) Mira Dei pietas; peccator mergitur undis, &c. —Greg. Nyssen. de Bapt. Christi. (t. 3. p. 372 b.) .... Ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ συγγενὲς τῆς γῆς στοιχεῖον τὸ ὕδωρ ἐρχόμενοι, ἐκείνῳ ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκρύπτομεν, ὡς ὁ Σωτὴρ τῇ γῇ· καὶ, τρίτον τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, τὴν τριήμερον ἑαυτοῖς τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριν ἐξεικονίζομεν. —Athanas. de Parabol. Evangel. quæst. 94. [al. 92.] t. 2. p. 422. (t. 2. p. 273 c.) Ὥσπερ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνέστη, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι θνήσκοντες, ἀνιστάμεθα. Τὸ γὰρ καταδῦσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τρίτον καὶ ἀναδῦσαι, τοῦτο δηλοῖ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν τριήμερον ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[60] Hær. 30. Ebion. n. 2. (t. 1. p. 126 a.) Προσέθετο γὰρ τὸ παρατηρεῖσθαι ἅπτεσθαί τινων τῶν ἀλλοεθνῶν, καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ ἡμέραν, εἴ ποτε γυναικὶ συναφθείη, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀναστῇ, βαπτίζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν· εἴ που δὲ ἂν εὐποροίη, ἢ θαλάσσης, ἢ ἄλλων ὑδάτων.—Ibid. n. 16. (p. 139 d.) Βάπτισμα δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ λαμβάνουσι, χωρὶς ὧν καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτίζονται.

[61] Vid. Tertul. cont. Marcion. l. 1. c. 29. (p. 380 c.) Non tingitur apud illum caro, nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi cœlebs, &c.

[62] Epiphan. Hær. 42. Marcion. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 304 b, c.) Οὐ μόνον δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ ἓν λουτρὸν δίδοται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕως τριῶν λουτρῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[63] Cont. Marcion. l. 1. c. 28. (p.

lentinians, to their baptism by water added another baptism by fire, which is mentioned by Tertullian[64]. But yet we find no charge brought against them for their first baptism, as if it were administered in any other way than by a total immersion. The only heretics against whom this charge is brought were the Eunomians, a branch of the Arians, of whom it was reported by Theodoret[65], that they baptized only the upper parts of the body as far as the breast. And this they did in a very preposterous way, as Epiphanius[66] relates,—*τοὺς πόδας ἄνω, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτω, with their heels upward, and their head downward.* Which sort of men are called *histopedes,* or *pederecti.* Whence the learned Gothofred[67] conjectures, that in one of the laws of Theodosius, where it is now read *Eunomiani spadones,* it should be *Eunomiani histopedes,* which signifies *men hanged up by the heels,* as he proves from Pausanias, Pollux, Hesychius, Harpocration, and others. So that these were the only men among all the heretics of the ancient Church that rejected this way of baptizing by a total immersion in ordinary cases.

Yet aspersion or

5. Indeed the Church was so punctual to this rule, that we

380 b.) Carnem mergit exsortem salutis.

64 Carm. cont. Marcion. l. 1. c. 7. (int. Spur. p. 631.) Namque Valentino Deus est insanus.... Bis docuit tingui, transducto corpore flamma.—Vid. Hieron. in Eph. 4. vv. 5, 6. (t. 7. p. 610 d.) *Unum baptisma,* et contra Valentinum facit, qui duo baptismata esse contendit..... Potest unum baptisma et ita dici, quod licet ter baptizemur propter mysterium Trinitatis, tamen unum baptisma reputetur. Unum quoque baptisma est in aqua, in Spiritu, et in igne.

65 Hæret. Fabul. l. 9. c. 3. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 356.) Καὶ βαπτίζοντες δὲ μέχρι τῶν στέρνων τῷ ὕδατι δεύουσι, τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις μερίοις τοῦ σώματος, ὡς ἐναγέσι, προσφέρειν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπαγορεύουσιν.

66 Hær. 76. Anomœor. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 992 c.) Ὅτι κατὰ κεφαλῆς τοὺς ἀναβαπτιζομένους βαπτίζει, καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἄνω, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτω.

67 In Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 5. de Hæreticis, leg. 17. (t. 6. p. 134.) Dudum igitur est, cum in ea Theodosii Magni constitutione vox illa *spadones* demenda suspecta mihi videri cœpit. Et sane, ut optima, ita elegantissima, Codicis Theodosiani editio Parisiensis ad marginem illius legis ex MS. exhibet, *Hispadones,* pro quo vulgata *Spadones,* detracto *Hi.* Qua simili ἀφαιρέσει et *Spania* alias pro *Hispania, stericæ* mulieres pro *histericis, Thynia* pro *Bithynia,* Isidoro aliaque his similia. Ea vero lectio ad veram tandem deduxisse me videtur: legam enim *Histapodes* vel *Histopodes.* Eunomiani scilicet, cum et alias de baptismatis iteratione inter hæreticos censerentur, quod ostendit Epiphanius, ... illo sane vel maxime inter alia notabiles erant, quod, quos e Catholicis vel hæreticis Arianis etiam, ad sectam suam concedentes, rebaptizarent, *capite demerso,* (κατωκάρα dicunt Græci,) *pedibus sursum versis,*.... una immersione baptizabant.

never read of any exception made to it in ordinary cases, no, not in the baptism of infants. For it appears from the Ordo Romanus, and Gregory's Sacramentarium, that infants as well as others were baptized by immersion[68]; and the rules of the Church, except in cases of danger, do still require it. But in two cases a mitigation of this rule was allowed. First, in case of sickness and extreme danger of life. Here that excellent rule, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," was always allowed to take place. Therefore that which the Ancients called *clinic baptism*, that is, *baptism by aspersion, or sprinkling upon a sick bed*, was never disputed against as an unlawful or imperfect baptism, though some laws were made to debar men, who were so baptized, from ascending to the dignities of the Church. For if men by neglect deferred their baptism to a sick bed, the Church in her prudence and discipline, because this delay was a fault she always declaimed against, thought fit to deny such men the privilege of ordination, as I have had occasion to show in a more proper place[69]. But yet she did not at any time attempt to annul such baptisms, or judge them imperfect as to what concerned the essence or substance of the action.

sprinkling allowed in some extraordinary cases.

This very question was moved by some, together with that of heretical baptism, in the time of Cyprian: but Cyprian, who determined against the validity of heretical baptism, makes no scruple in this case, but offers arguments to prove such clinic baptism by aspersion to have all the necessary conditions of a true baptism. For though this was the case of Novatian, who had not been washed, but only sprinkled upon a sick bed, yet Cyprian[70] had no objection against his Christianity upon that

[68] See nn. 48 and 49, preceding.

[69] B. 4. ch. 3. s. 11. v. 2. p. 49.

[70] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magnum, p. 185. (p. 297.) Quæsisti etiam, fili carissime, quid mihi de illis videatur, qui in infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi Christiani, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi. Qua in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat. Nos, quantum concipit mediocritas nostra, æstimamus, in nullo mutilari et debilitari posse beneficia divina, nec minus aliquid illic posse contingere, ubi plena et tota fide et dantis et sumentis accipitur, quod de divinis muneribus hauritur. Neque enim sic in sacramento salutari delictorum contagia, ut in lavacro carnali et sæculari sordes cutis et corporis, abluuntur, ut aphronitris, et cæteris quoque adjumentis, et solio et piscina opus sit, quibus ablui et mundari corpusculum possit. Aliter pectus credentis abluitur, aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur. In sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate cogente, et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum cre-

account: but declares, that 'as far as he was able to judge, all such baptisms were perfect, where there was no defect in the faith of the giver or the receiver: for the contagion of sin was not washed away, as the filth of the body is, by a carnal and secular washing. There was no need of a lake or other such-like helps to wash and cleanse it. The heart of a believer was otherwise washed; the mind of a man was cleansed by the merit of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity requires, God grants his indulgence by a short way of performing them.' This lawfulness of aspersion in such cases he proves from those words of God in Ezekiel, (36, 25,) "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." And from several other texts, (Numb. 8, 7. 19, 9. 19, 19.) where the water of sprinkling is called "the water of purification." Whence he concludes, 'that the sprinkling of water was as effectual as washing: and what the Church did in this case, in compliance with necessity and men's infirmities, was neither displeasing to God, nor detrimental to the party baptized, who received a full and complete sacrament by the power of God, and the truth of his own faith together.' And therefore he blames those who nicknamed these men *Clinics*, instead of Christians. It further appears from the canons which speak of these, that they were only denied orders, not the name of Christians. The Council of Neo-Cæsarea[71] allows them in time of great emergency, or in case of great merit, to be or-

dentibus conferunt divina compendia.... Unde apparet, aspersionem quoque aquæ instar salutaris lavacri obtinere; et quando hæc in ecclesia fiunt, ubi sit et dantis et accipientis fides integra, stare omnia et consummari ac perfici posse majestate Domini et fidei veritate..... Quod quidam eos, salutari aqua et fide legitima Christi gratiam consecutos, non Christianos sed Clinicos vocant, non invenio, unde hoc nomen assumant; nisi forte, qui plura et secretiora legerunt apud Hippocratem vel Soranum, κλινικοὺς istos deprehenderunt. Ego enim, qui clinicum de evangelio novi, scio paralytico illi et debili, per longæ ætatis curricula in lecto jacenti, nihil infirmitatem suam offuisse, quo minus ad firmitatem cœlestem plenissime perveniret: nec tantum indulgentia Dominica excitatum de grabato esse, sed ipsum grabatum suum, reparatis et vegetatis viribus, sustulisse. Et idcirco, quantum fide concipere et sentire nobis datur, mea sententia hæc est; ut Christianus judicetur legitimus, quisquis fuerit in ecclesia, lege et jure fidei divinam gratiam consecutus, &c.

[71] C. 12. (t. 1. p. 1484 b.) Ἐὰν νοσῶν τις φωτισθῇ, εἰς πρεσβύτερον ἄγεσθαι οὐ δύναται· οὐκ ἐκ προαιρέσεως γὰρ ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης· εἰ μὴ τάχα διὰ τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ σπουδὴν καὶ πίστιν, καὶ διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων.

dained, as Novatian was, for his pregnant parts, and the hopes which the Church had conceived of him, as Eusebius out of the Epistle of Cornelius[72] informs us. The Council of Laodicea[73] appoints such, if they recover, to learn the Creed, but says not a word of rebaptizing them. And it appears from the Council of Auxerre[74] that these clinics were allowed to be baptized at any time when necessity required, without staying for a solemn festival. So that many things were indulged to them which were not allowed by the ordinary rules of the Church.

Secondly, another case in which sprinkling was accepted instead of immersion, was in times of difficulty, when a sufficient quantity of water could not be procured. As when a martyr was to be baptized in prison, or was to baptize any other under such a confinement. Thus we read in the ancient Acts of St. Laurence[75], referred to by Walafridus Strabo[76], how one Romanus, a soldier, was baptized by him in a pitcher of water. And again[77], how one Lucillus was baptized by the same martyr, only by pouring water upon his head. But as both these were extraordinary cases, they only show us, how far the Church could dispense with this rule upon reasons of necessity or charity, not what was her standing and ordinary practice. Some learned persons[78] think Tertullian[79] alludes

[72] L. 6. c. 13. (v. 1. p. 314. 12.) *Καταλιπὼν γὰρ ὁ λαμπρὸς οὗτος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ᾗ πιστεύσας κατηξιώθη τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου κατὰ χάριν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, τοῦ ἐπιθέντος αὐτῷ χεῖρας εἰς πρεσβυτερίου κλῆρον· ὃς, διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαϊκῶν πολλῶν, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα, ὥσπερ καὶ οὗτος, εἰς κλῆρόν τινα γενέσθαι, ἠξίωσε συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοῦτον μόνον χειροτονῆσαι.*

[73] C. 47. (t. 1. p. 1505 a.) *Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβάνοντας, ἐκμανθάνειν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ γινώσκειν, ὅτι θείας δωρεᾶς κατηξιώθησαν.*

[74] C. 18. See before, ch. 6. s. 7. p. 108. n. 11.

[75] Ap. Surium, Aug. 10. de SS. Laurent. Mart. c. 20. (t. 4. p. 614.) Unus ex militibus, Romanus nomine, . . . urceum afferens cum aqua opportunitatem captabat, qua eam offerret Beato Laurentio, ut baptizaretur.

[76] De Reb. Eccles. c. 26. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 10. p. 692. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 15. p. 197 a. 7.) Notandum autem non solum mergendo, verum etiam desuper fundendo, multos baptizatos fuisse, et adhuc posse ita baptizari, si necessitas sit, sicut in passione B. Laurentii quendam, urceo allato, legimus baptizatum.

[77] Ap. Surium, ubi supr. c. 15. (t. 4. p. 612.). . . . Benedixitque aquam, et, cum exspoliasset eum, fudit super caput ejus, dicens: Credis in Deum, &c.?

[78] Vid. Bevereg. Not. in Can. Apost. 50. (ap. Cotel. v. 1. p. 468.) Quinetiam ipse quoque Tertullianus huc alludere videtur, ubi ait; *Quis etiam tibi, &c.*

[79] De Pœnitent. c. 6. (p. 124 c.) Quis enim tibi tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro asperginem unam cujuslibet aquæ commodabit?

to the allowance of sprinkling in extraordinary cases, when speaking of men's pretending to be baptized, without true repentance, he says, 'no man would grant such false penitents so much as one aspersion of water.' And Gregory Nyssen[80] perhaps refers to it also in that famous story, which he tells of one Archias, who, having neglected his opportunity of receiving baptism, was at last suddenly surprised by death at a season when there was no possibility of obtaining it: and then he cried out in that languishing condition, 'O ye mountains and woods, baptize me! O ye trees, and rocks and fountains, give me this grace!' and with these words, being wounded to death, he expired in the hands of his enemies. This man's condition he compares to those, who have the sudden summons of death upon a sick bed: they then begin to call for a vessel of water, a priest, and words to prepare them for baptism; but the violence of their disease prevents them from obtaining it. This seems to imply, that such a sprinkling as men might have upon a sick bed, in cases of extremity, was reputed a saving baptism; and it was an unhappiness in some, that they could not obtain even that at their last hour, which the Church allowed as the last refuge only in such extraordinary cases.

Trine immersion, the general practice for several ages. The reasons of this.

6. But I must observe further, that they not only administered baptism by immersion under water, but also repeated this three times. Tertullian[81] speaks of it as a ceremony generally used in his time: 'We dip not once, but three times, at the naming every Person of the Trinity.' The same is asserted by St. Basil[82], and St. Jerom[83], and the author under the name of Dionysius[84], who says likewise, 'that it was done at the distinct

[80] De Bapt. (t. 2. p. 220 c.) Πεσὼν δὲ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον ἐπειγόμενος, ὡς εἶχε δυνάμεως, ἀνεβόα, (καὶ γὰρ ἦν τῶν ἀμνήτων)· Ὄρη καὶ νάπαι βαπτίσατε· δένδρα καὶ πέτραι καὶ πηγαί, δότε τὴν χάριν· καὶ ταῖς οἰκτραῖς φωναῖς ταύταις ἐπετελεύτησεν. . . . Παραπλήσιοι δὲ τούτῳ καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν νόσων ἀθρόως πιεζόμενοι· . . . πάντα ἐν ῥοπῇ καιροῦ ὀξέως ζητεῖται, τὰ σκεύη, τὸ ὕδωρ, ὁ ἱερεὺς, ὁ λόγος, ὁ πρὸς τὴν χάριν προευτρεπίζων.

[81] Cont. Prax. c. 26. (p. 516 b.) Nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in Personas singulas tinguimur. —De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Dehinc ter mergitamur, &c.

[82] De Spir. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 76 b. n. 66.) Τὸ δὲ τρὶς βαπτίζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον πόθεν;

[83] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 8.] (t. 2. p. 180 e.) . . . Multa alia, quæ per traditionem in ecclesiis observantur auctoritatem sibi scriptæ legis usurpaverunt, velut in lavacro ter caput mergitare, &c.

[84] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part. 2. n. 7. p. 254. (t. 1. p. 169 d.) Ὁ ἱεράρχης

mention of each Person of the blessed Trinity.' St. Ambrose[85] is most particular in the description of this rite: 'Thou wast asked,' says he, 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? And thou repliedst, I believe, and wast dipped, that is, buried. A second demand was made, Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, and in his cross? Thou answeredst again, I believe, and wast dipped. Therefore thou wast buried with Christ. For he that is buried with Christ rises again with Christ. A third time the question was repeated, Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? And thy answer was, I believe. Then thou wast dipped a third time, that thy triple confession might absolve thee from the various offences of thy former life.'

Two reasons are commonly assigned for this practice. First, that it might represent Christ's three days' burial, and his resurrection on the third day. 'We cover ourselves in the water,' says Gregory Nyssen[86], 'as Christ did in the earth, and this we do three times to represent the grace of his resurrection performed after three days.' In like manner Cyril of Jerusalem[87], and the author of the Questions upon the Scripture under the name of Athanasius[88]. Thus likewise Pope Leo[89], among the Latins: 'The trine immersion is an imitation

ἄνωθεν ἑστηκὼς, ἀναβοησάντων πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεράρχου κατὰ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τελουμένου τῶν ἱερέων, τρὶς μὲν αὐτὸν ὁ ἱεράρχης βαπτίζει, ταῖς τρισὶ τοῦ τελουμένου καταδύσεσι καὶ ἀναδύσεσι, τὴν τρισσὴν τῆς Θείας Μακαριότητος ἐπιβοήσας ὑπόστασιν.— [Conf. Chrysost. Hom. 24. in Ioan. p. 158. Ed. Bened. 25. al. 24. (t. 8. p. 146 d.) *Τρίτον δὲ τοῦτο γίνεται, ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι δύναμις Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἅπαντα ταῦτα πληροῖ.* Ed.]

[85] De Sacrament. l. 2. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 359 d. n. 20.) Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? dixisti, Credo, et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, Credis in Dominum nostrum, Iesum Christum? et in crucem ejus? dixisti, Credo, et mersisti. Ideo et Christo es consepultus. Qui enim Christo consepelitur, cum Christo resurgit. Tertio interrogatus es, Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? dixisti, Credo. Tertio mersisti, ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.

[86] De Bapt. Christi. (t. 3. p. 372.) *Ὕδατι ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκρύπτομεν, ὡς ὁ Σωτὴρ τῇ γῇ, καὶ τρίτον τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, τὴν τριήμερον ἑαυτοῖς τῆς ἀναστάσεως χάριν ἐξεικονίζομεν.*

[87] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. n. 4. (p. 312 d.) . . . *Καὶ ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν, καὶ κατεδύετε τρίτον εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε· καὶ ἐνταῦθα διὰ συμβόλου τὴν τριήμερον τοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰνιττόμενοι ταφήν.*

[88] De Parabol. Evangel. quæst. 94. [al. 92.] See before, s. 4., the latter part of n. 59, preceding.

[89] Ep. 4. ad Episc. Sicul. c. 3. (CC. t. 3. p. 1299 b.) Sepulturam triduanam imitatur trina demersio, et ab aquis elevatio resurgentis adinstar est de sepulcro. [Conf. Hug. Menard. Not. 323. ad Sacramentar. Greg. M. (Ed. Bened. Oper. t. 3.

of the three days' burial; and the rising again out of the water, is an image of Christ rising from the grave.' Secondly, another reason was, that it might represent their profession of faith in the Holy Trinity, in whose name they were baptized. St. Austin[90] joins both reasons together, telling us 'there was a twofold mystery signified in this way of baptizing: the trine immersion was both a symbol of the Holy Trinity, in whose name we are baptized, and also a type of the Lord's burial, and of his resurrection on the third day from the dead. For we are buried with Christ by baptism, and rise again with him by faith.' St. Jerom[91] makes this ceremony to be a symbol of the Unity, as well as the Trinity. For, says he, 'We are thrice dipped in the water, that the mystery of the Trinity may appear to be but one: we are not baptized in the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in one name, which is God.' And therefore he adds, 'that though we be thrice put under water to represent the mystery of the Trinity, yet it is reputed but one baptism.'

The original of this practice.

7. The original of this custom is not exactly agreed upon by the Ancients. Some derive it from apostolical tradition; others from the first institution of baptism by our Saviour; whilst others esteem it only an indifferent circumstance or ceremony, that may be used, or omitted, without any detriment

p. 353 a. 13.)... Et apud S. Leonem Epist. 4., qui cum SS. Cyrillo et Gregorio Nysseno supra citatis scribit, hac triduana immersione et ab aquis elevatione significari triduanam Christi sepulturam et post triduum resurrectionem. Alia est etiam hujus ritus ratio, nempe, Trinitatis personarum memoria, ut vult S. Gregorius Papa, Epist. 41. [nunc est 43.] l. 1. Regesti [s. Registri.] (t. 2. p. 532 b. 1.) *Nos autem quod tertio mergimus, &c.* Unde Eunomium, quod Sanctam Trinitatem non crederet, unicam immersionem invexisse ferunt. Ed.]

[90] Hom. 3. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. 4. c. 78. (t. 1. p. 2007. 79.) Postquam vos credere promisistis, tertio capita vestra in sacro fonte demersimus. Qui ordo baptismatis duplici mysterii significatione celebratur. Recte enim tertio mersi estis, qui accepistis baptismum in nomine sanctæ Trinitatis. Recte tertio mersi estis, qui accepistis baptismum in nomine Jesu Christi, qui die tertia resurrexit a mortuis. Illa enim tertio repetita demersio typum Dominicæ exprimit sepulturæ, per quam Christo consepulti estis in baptismo, et cum Christo resurrexistis in fide: ut, peccatis abluti, in sanctitate virtutum Christum imitando vivatis.

[91] L. 2. in Eph. 4. p. 222. (t. 7. p. 610 c.) Et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum, et non baptizamur in nominibus Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, sed in uno nomine, quod intelligitur Deus. ... Potest et unum baptisma ita dici, quod licet ter baptizemur propter mysterium Trinitatis, tamen unum baptisma reputetur.

to the sacrament itself, or breach of any divine appointment. Tertullian[92], St. Basil[93], and St. Jerom[94], put it among those rites of the Church, which they reckon to be handed down from apostolical tradition. St. Chrysostom[95] seems rather to make it part of the first institution. For he says, 'Christ delivered to his disciples one baptism in three immersions of the body, when he said to them, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."' And Theodoret[96] was of the same opinion: for he charges Eunomius as making an innovation upon the original institution of baptism, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, in that he made a contrary law, that men should not be baptized with three immersions, nor with invocation of the Trinity, but only with one immersion into the death of Christ. Pope Pelagius[97] brought the same charge against some others in his time, who baptized in the name of Christ only with one immersion, which he condemns 'as contrary to the Gospel-command given by Christ, who appointed every one to be baptized in the name of the Trinity, and that with three immersions, say-

[92] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 101 d.) Ergo quæramus, an et traditio nisi scripta non debeat recipi? Plane negabimus recipiendam, si nulla exempla præjudicent aliarum observationum, quas sine ullius Scripturæ instrumento, solius traditionis titulo, et exinde consuetudinis patrocinio, vindicamus. Denique ut a baptismate ingrediar, aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu, contestamur nos renuntiare Diabolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit.

[93] De Spir. Sanct. c. 27. See s. 6. n. 82, preceding.

[94] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. See ibid. n. 83, preceding.—Conf. Sozom. l. 6. c. 26. (t. 2. p. 252. 25.) *Φασὶ δέ τινες, πρῶτον τοῦτον Εὐνόμιον τολμῆσαι εἰσηγήσασθαι, ἐν μιᾷ καταδύσει χρῆναι ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν θείαν βάπτισιν, καὶ παραχαράξαι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, εἰσέτι νῦν ἐν πᾶσι φυλαττομένην, παράδοσιν.*

[95] Hom. de Fide, juxt. Ed. Savil. t. 7. p. 290. 25. (juxt. Ed. Bened. t. 9. int. Spuria, p. 855 e.) ... *Ἐν τρισὶ καταδύσεσι τοῦ σώματος ἓν βάπτισμα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς παραδέδωκε, &c.*

[96] Hæret. Fabul. l. 4. c. 3. p. 236. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 356.) *Αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος ἀνέτρεψε τὸν ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Ἀποστόλων παραδοθέντα θεσμὸν, καὶ ἄντικρυς ἀντενομοθέτησε, μὴ χρῆναι λέγων τρὶς καταδύειν τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, μηδὲ ποιεῖσθαι τὴν τῆς Τριάδος ἐπίκλησιν· ἀλλ' ἅπαξ βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

[97] Ep. ad. Gaudent. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. 4. c. 82. (t. 1. p. 2009. 19.) Multi sunt, qui in nomine solummodo Christi, una etiam mersione se asserunt baptizare. Evangelicum vero præceptum, ipso Deo et Domino salvatore nostro Iesu Christo tradente, nos admonet, in nomine Trinitatis, trina etiam mersione sanctum baptisma unicuique tribuere, dicente Domino discipulis suis; *Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.*

ing to his disciples, "Go, baptize all nations, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."' And this was so far esteemed a divine obligation by the authors of the Apostolical Canons[98], that they order every bishop or presbyter to be deposed, who should administer baptism not by three immersions, but only by one in the name of Christ; because Christ said not, "Baptize into my death," but, "Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." It is plain, all these writers thought this a necessary circumstance from our Saviour's institution. And the Eunomians, who first rejected this, are condemned by Theodoret and Sozomen, as making a new law of baptizing, not only against the general practice, but against the general rule and tradition of the Church.

When first the Church allowed of any alteration in it.

8. Yet there happened a circumstance in the Spanish Churches in after-ages, which gave a little turn to this affair. For the Arians in Spain, not being of the sect of the Eunomians, continued for many years to baptize with three immersions: but then they abused this ceremony to a very perverse end, to patronize their error about the Son and Holy Ghost, as being of a different nature or essence from the Father. For they made the three immersions to denote a difference, or degrees of divinity in the Three Divine Persons. To oppose whose wicked doctrine, and that they might not seem to symbolize with them in any practice that might give encouragement to it, some Catholics began to leave off the trine immersion, as savouring of Arianism, and took up the single immersion in opposition to them. But this was like to prove matter of scandal and schism among the Catholics themselves. And therefore in the time of Gregory the Great, Leander, bishop of Seville, wrote to him for his advice and resolution in this case; to which he returned this answer[99]: 'Concerning the three

[98] C. 49. al. 50. (Cotel. [c. 42.] v. 1. p. 444.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἓν βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος, Εἰς τὸν θάνατόν μου βαπτίσατε· ἀλλὰ, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατέρος, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

[99] L. i. Ep. 41. ad Leandr. (CC. t. 5. p. 1054 c.) De trina vero mersione baptismatis nil responderi verius potest, quam quod ipsi sensistis, quod in una fide nil officit sanctæ ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. Nos autem quod tertio mergimus triduanæ sepulturæ sacramenta signamus, ut dum tertio infans ab aquis educitur, resurrectio triduani temporis exprimatur. Quod si quis forte

immersions in baptism, you have judged very truly already, that different rites and customs do not prejudice the holy Church, whilst the unity of faith remains entire. The reason why we use three immersions at Rome is to signify the mystery of Christ's three days' burial, that whilst an infant is thrice lifted up out of the water the resurrection on the third day may be expressed thereby. But if any one thinks this is rather done in regard to the Holy Trinity, a single immersion in baptism does no way prejudice that: for so long as the unity of substance is preserved in three Persons, it is no harm whether a child be baptized with one immersion or three; because three immersions may represent the Trinity of Persons, and one immersion the Unity of the Godhead. But forasmuch as heretics use to baptize their infants with three immersions, I think you ought not to do so; lest this multiplication of immersions be interpreted a division of the Godhead, and give them occasion to glory, that their custom has prevailed.'

Yet this judgment of Pope Gregory did not satisfy all men in the Spanish Church: for still many kept to the old way of baptizing by three immersions, notwithstanding this fear of symbolising with the Arians. Therefore some time after, about the year 633, the fourth Council of Toledo [1], which was a

etiam pro summæ Trinitatis veratione existimet fieri; neque ad hoc aliquid obsistit baptizando semel in aquis mergere: quia dum in tribus Personis una substantia est, reprehensibile esse nullatenus potest, infantem in baptismate vel ter, vel semel immergere; quando et in tribus mersionibus Personarum Trinitas, et in una potest Divinitatis singularitas designari. Sed quia nunc huc usque ab hæreticis infans in baptismo tertio mergebatur, fiendum apud vos esse non censeo: ne, dum mersiones enumerant, Divinitatem divident; dumque quod faciebant faciunt, se morem vestrum vicisse glorientur.

[1] C. 5. [al. 6.] (t. 5. p. 1706 a.) De baptismi autem sacramento, propter quod in Hispaniis quidam sacerdotes trinam, simplam quidam mersionem faciunt, a nonnullis schisma esse conspicitur, et unitas fidei scindi videtur. Nam dum partes diversæ [al. patres diverso] in baptizandis aliquo contrario modo agunt, ab aliis non baptizatos esse contendunt... Quapropter, qui de utroque sacramento, quod fit in sancto baptismo, a tanto viro reddita est ratio, quod utrumque rectum, utrumque irreprehensibile in sancta Dei ecclesia habeatur: propter vitandum autem schismatis scandalum vel hæretici dogmatis usum, simplicem teneamus baptismi mersionem; ne videantur apud nos, qui tertio mergunt, hæreticorum approbare assertionem, dum sequuntur, et morem. Et ne forte cuiquam sit dubium hujus simpli mysterium sacramenti, videat in eo mortem et resurrectionem Christi significari. Nam in aquis mersio quasi ad infernum descensio est, et rursus ab aquis emersio resurrectio est. Item videat in eo Unitatem Divinitatis, . . .

general Council of all Spain, was forced to make another decree to determine this matter, and settle the peace of the Church. For whilst some priests baptized with three immersions, and the others but with one, a schism was raised, endangering the unity of the faith. For the contending parties carried the matter so high, as to pretend, that they, who were baptized in a way contrary to their own, were not baptized at all. To remedy which evil the fathers of this Council first repeat the judgment of Pope Gregory, and then immediately conclude upon it, that though both these ways of baptism were just and unblamable in themselves, according to the opinion of that great man; yet as well to avoid the scandal of schism, as the usage of heretics, they decree, 'that only one immersion should be used in baptism, lest if any used three immersions, they might seem to approve the opinion of heretics, whilst they followed their practice. And that no one might be dubious about the use of a single immersion, he might consider, that the death and resurrection of Christ were represented by it. For the immersion in water was as it were the descending into hell or the grave, and the immersion out of the water was a resurrection. He might also observe the Unity of the Deity, and the Trinity of Persons to be signified by it. The Unity by a single immersion, and the Trinity by giving baptism in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

Some learned persons [2] find fault with this Council for changing this ancient custom upon so slight a reason, as that of the Arians using it: which, if it were any reason, would hold as well against a single immersion, because the Eunomians, a baser sect of the Arians, were the first inventors of that

dum semel mergimus: Trinitatem, dum in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizamus.

[2] Walafrid. Strabo, de Reb. Eccles. c. 26. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 10. p. 692. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 15. p. 196 h. 16.) Quæ singularis mersio, quamvis tum ita Hispanis complacuit, dicentibus, 'trinam mersionem ideo vitandam, quia hæretici quidam dissimiles in Trinitate substantias dogmatizare ausi sunt, ad consubstantialitatem Sanctæ Trinitatis negandam;' tamen antiquior usus prævaluit et ratio supra dicta. Si enim omnia deserimus, quæ hæretici in suam perversitatem traxerunt, nihil nobis restabit: quum illi in ipso Deo errantes, omnia, quæ ad ejus cultum pertinere visa sunt, suis erroribus quasi propria applicarint — Vossius, de Bapt. disp. 2. thes. 4. p. 46. (t. 6. p. 162.) Optime Walafridus. Nam si, propter hæreticos ter immergentes, semel immergere oportet; itidem, ob semel immergentes, ter mergitare necesse erit.

practice. And therefore the exception made by this Spanish Council, in the seventh century, cannot prejudice the more ancient and general practice of the Church, which, as Strabo observed, still prevailed after this Council; and if Vossius says true, the trine immersion, or what corresponds to it, the trine aspersion, is the general practice of all Churches upon earth at this day. And such a custom could not well be laid aside, without some charge of novelty, and danger of giving offence and scandal to weaker brethren.

I have now gone over the several circumstances and ceremonies accompanying baptism, so far as to make it a complete sacrament, and the instrument of salvation to all worthy receivers, if they happened to die without any further consummation, as sometimes they did, when baptism was administered to them with less solemnity, either in times of sickness, or at some distance from the mother-church; in both which cases they had the substance of the sacrament, but not all the ceremonies that were appointed to attend it. They were supposed to be made partakers of Christ's body and to eat his flesh, and to be washed in his blood, which was drinking it by faith, in baptism, as well as in the eucharist. And if they survived, they were also admitted immediately to the symbols of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist. But there were some other ceremonies following baptism as it were to finish the solemnity of it; some of which were introductory and preparatory to the eucharist, as the second unction accompanying baptism, which we commonly call imposition of hands, or confirmation. Of which, because it will be necessary to speak a little more distinctly, I shall make it and the remaining ceremonies of baptism the subject of another Book.

BOOK XII.

OF CONFIRMATION, AND OTHER CEREMONIES FOLLOWING BAPTISM, BEFORE MEN WERE MADE PARTAKERS OF THE EUCHARIST.

CHAP. I.

Of the time when, and the persons to whom confirmation was administered.

Confirmation anciently given immediately after baptism, if the bishop were present.

1. IMMEDIATELY after the persons came up out of the water, if the bishop were present at the solemnity, they were presented to him, in order to receive his benediction, which was a solemn prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon such as were baptized: and to this prayer there was usually joined the ceremony of a second unction, and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross; whence the whole action many times took these names, χρίσμα *the unction*, χειροθεσία *the imposition of hands*, and σφραγὶς *the sign* or *seal* of the Lord, which are names much more common among the Ancients than that of *confirmation*. But by all these names they understood one and the same thing, which was the bishop's prayer for the descent of the Spirit upon persons newly baptized. This was always administered together with baptism, if the bishop, who was the ordinary minister of it, were present at the action. But if he were absent, as it usually happened to be in churches at a distance from the mother-church, or when persons were baptized in haste upon a sick-bed, then confirmation was deferred till the bishop could have a convenient opportunity to visit them. This we learn from St. Jerom[1], who speaks of it as customary

[1] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 9.] (t. 2. p. 181 a.) Non abnuo hanc esse ecclesiarum consuetudinem, ut ad eos, qui longe in minoribus [al. a majoribus] urbibus per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati sunt, episcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat.

in the Church for bishops to go and invocate the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands on such as were baptized by presbyters and deacons in villages and places remote from the mother-church. And it many times happened that such persons died before the bishop could come to give them imposition of hands. To prevent which inconvenience, the canons in some places obliged bishops to visit their whole dioceses once every year; and if they were so large that they could not do so, then they were to divide their dioceses and make them less, as we find it decreed and practised in some[2] of the Spanish Councils. But in case persons were baptized in the presence of the bishop, then without any delay they were immediately confirmed with imposition of hands and the holy unction. Tertullian[3] says very plainly, 'that as soon as they came out of the water they were anointed with the oil of consecration, and then received imposition of hands, inviting down the Holy Spirit by that benediction.' And so Cyril of Jerusalem[4] represents it, when he tells the neophytes, 'that as soon as they came up out of the waters of the font, they received the chrism of unction, with the anti-type of which, that is, the Holy Ghost, Christ was anointed when he came up out of Jordan.' In like manner the author of the Constitutions[5], describing the ceremonies of baptism, orders the priest, 'as soon as he has baptized any one, to

—Ibid. (d.) . . . . . In villulis aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros aut diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt, quam ab episcopis inviserentur.—Vid. C. Eliber. c. 77. (t. 1. p. 978 e.) Si quis diaconus, regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debet.

[2] C. Lucens. (t. 5. p. 874 c.) Cupio, sanctissimi patres, ut provida utilitate decernatis, in provincia regni nostri, quia in tota Gallæciæ regione spatiosæ satis diœceses a paucis episcopis tenentur; ita ut aliquantæ ecclesiæ per singulos annos vix possint a suo episcopo visitari: insuper tantæ provinciæ unus tantummodo metropolitanus episcopus est, et de extremis quibusque parochiis longum est singulis annis ad concilium convenire.

[3] De Bapt. c. 7. (p. 226 d.) Exinde egressi de lavacro perunguimur benedicta unctione.—C. 8. (ibid.) Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum Sanctum.

[4] Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 1. (p. 316 a.) Κἀκεῖνος μὲν ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ λουσάμενος ποταμῷ, καὶ τῶν χρώτων [al. φώτων] τῆς θεότητος μεταδοὺς τοῖς ὕδασιν, ἀνέβαινεν ἐκ τούτων· καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου οὐσιώδης ἐπιφοίτησις αὐτῷ ἐγένετο, τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἐπαναπαυομένου τοῦ ὁμοίου· καὶ ὑμῖν ὁμοίως, ἀναβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων, ἐδόθη χρίσμα, τὸ ἀντίτυπον, οὗ ἐχρίσθη Χριστός· τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

[5] L. 7. cc. 43. and 44. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.). . Μετὰ τοῦτο βαπτίσας αὐτὸν, ... χρισάτω μύρῳ, ἐπιλέγων· Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς, κ. τ. λ.

anoint him with the holy chrism, and give him imposition of hands,' saying a prayer, which is there appointed. Thus we find in the Life of St. Basil[6], how 'Maximinus, the bishop, who baptized him and Eubulus together, immediately clothed them with the white garments, and anointed them with the holy chrism, and gave them the communion.' The same may be observed in the description of the ceremonies of baptism given by the author under the name of Dionysius[7], by St. Ambrose[8], Optatus[9], Pacian[10], and all others amongst the Ancients, who have made any mention of the time of administering confirmation.

And this as well to infants as adult persons. Which is evidenced,

2. Nor was this only true with respect to adult persons, but also with respect to infants, who were anciently confirmed by imposition of hands and the holy chrism or unction, as soon as they were baptized. Which perhaps will seem a paradox to many, who look no further than to the practice of later ages:

[6] Ap. Amphiloch. c. 5. Baptizavit Maximinus episcopus Basilium et Eubulum, et vestivit albis, atque, ungens eos sancto chrismate, tradidit eis communionem. [I can find no authority precisely for these words. But in the *Vita Basilii Amphilochio adscripta, cap. 2. n. 29., ap. Bolland. Act. Sanctor, die decimaquarta Junii,* Antwerp. 1698, (t. 2. p. 943.) I find the words following;—*Admirans autem Maximus Basilii fidem, precibusque super eum fusis, resurrectionis Christi vestibus induit. Baptizavit autem et Eubulum, tingensque sacro unguento, tradidit vivificam communionem*—Conf. Vit. Basil. Græce, ap. Oper. Amphiloch. ex Ed. Combefis, Paris. 1644. (p. 173 a. cap. 4.)...Ὁ Μάξιμος.. ἐπευξάμενος αὐτῷ ἐνδιδύσκει τὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἀναστάσεως ἄμφια..... χρίσας τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ' ἐβάπτισε δὲ καὶ τὸν Εὔβουλον. Ed.]

[7] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. [part. 3. n. 8.] p. 260. (t. 1. p. 173 c.] Ἑξῆς δὲ φωτοειδεῖς ἐσθῆτας ἐπιβάλλουσι τῷ τελουμένῳ...Ἡ δὲ τοῦ μύρου τελειωτικὴ χρίσις εὐώδη ποιεῖ τὸν τετελεσμένον.... Ἐν τέλει δὲ πάντων ὁ ἱεράρχης ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερωτάτην εὐχαριστίαν καλεῖ τὸν τετελεσμένον, καὶ τῆς τῶν τελεστικῶν μυστηρίων αὐτῷ μεταδίδωσι κοινωνίας.

[8] De Sacrament. l. 3. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 363 e. n. 8.) Sequitur spiritale signaculum, quod audistis hodie legi, quia post fontem superest, ut perfectio fiat, quando ad invocationem sacerdotis Spiritus Sanctus infunditur... Post hæc quid sequitur? Venire habes ad altare, etc.

[9] L. 4. p. 81. (p. 94.) Descendit [Christus] in aquam, non quia erat quod in Deo mundaretur, sed venturum oleum aqua debuit antecedere, ad mysteria initianda et ordinanda et implenda baptismatis. Lotus cum in Ioannis manibus haberetur, secutus est ordo mysterii; et complevit Pater, quod rogaverat Filius, et quod nuntiaverat Spiritus Sanctus: apertum est cœlum Deo Patre ungente; spiritale oleum statim in imagine columbæ descendit, et insedit capiti ejus, et perfudit eum; unde cœpit dici Christus, quando unctus est a Deo Patre: cui ne manus impositio defuisse videretur, vox audita est Dei de nube dicentis, *Hic est Filius meus, de quo bene sensi, hunc audite.*

[10] Serm. de Bapt. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 3. p. 77. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 275 a.) Hæc autem compleri alias nequeunt, &c. See n. 31, following.

but it may be undeniably evidenced these two ways. First, from plain testimonies of the Ancients declaring it so to be. And, secondly, from that known custom and usage of the Church in giving the eucharist to infants, which ordinarily presupposes their confirmation. First, for the testimonies of the Ancients, nothing can be plainer than those words of Gennadius[11]: 'If they be infants that are baptized, let those that present them to baptism answer for them according to the common way of baptizing: and then let them be confirmed with imposition of hands and chrism, and so be admitted to partake of the eucharist.' In like manner Pope Innocent, in one of his decrees[12], says, 'Infants are not to be consigned or confirmed by any but the bishop.' And, in the Collection of Canons made by Martin Bracarensis out of those of the Greek Church, this is one[13]; 'that a presbyter may not consign infants in the presence of the bishop, except he be particularly appointed by the bishop to do it.'

first, from some plain testimonies.

This practice continued in the Church for many ages; for it is mentioned by Pope Gregory both in his Sacramentarium and in his Epistles[14], and after him by all the writers in the eighth and ninth centuries. Alcuin[15], who wrote about the Offices of the Church in the time of Charles the Great, speaking of infant-baptism, says; 'After an infant is baptized, he is to be clothed, and brought to the bishop, if he be present, who is to confirm him with chrism, and give him the communion; and if the bishop be not present, the presbyter shall communicate him.' The same is in the Ordo Romanus[16],

[11] De Dogmat. Eccles. c. 52. [c. 22. juxt. Ed. Bened. Oper. August. (t. 8. append. p. 78 b.)] Si parvuli sint...respondeant pro illis, qui eos offerunt, juxta morem baptizandi, et sic, manus impositione et chrismate communiti, eucharistiæ mysteriis admittantur.

[12] Ep. 1. c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1246 b.) De consignandis vero infantibus manifestum est non ab alio, quam ab episcopo fieri licere.

[13] C. 52. (CC. t. 5. p. 911 d.) Presbyter præsente episcopo non signet infantes, nisi forte ab episcopo fuerit illi præceptum.

[14] L. 3. Ep. 9. (CC. ibid. p. 1142 b.) Presbyteri baptizatos infantes signare sacro in frontibus chrismate non præsumant, sed presbyteri baptizatos ungant in pectore, ut episcopi postmodum ungere debeant in fronte.

[15] De Officiis, in capite, De Sabbato Paschæ, ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 10. p. 259. (ap. Oper. Alcuin. p. 1064 a.) Postea vestiatur [al. vestitur] infans vestimentis suis. Si vero episcopus adest, statim confirmari eum oportet chrismate, et postea communicare; et si episcopus deest, communicetur a presbytero.

[16] Capite, De Bapt. ap. Bibl. Patr. ibid. p. 83. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 13.

a book written and used as a liturgy about the same time: where, after the bishop has given the white garment to infants, he lifts up his hand and lays it upon their heads, praying for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them; and, signing them with the sign of the cross in the forehead, he says, 'I confirm thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' Baluzius, in his Notes upon Rhegino[17], gives us two ancient manuscript Pontificals of the ninth century, wherein this order for confirming infants is continued. And to these he adds an Epistle of Jesse[18], bishop of Amiens, describing the order of baptism, where the rule is for the bishop, 'after the child has been baptized with three immersions, to confirm him with chrism in the forehead, and then to confirm him, (for so it is worded), or communicate him, with the body and blood of Christ.

These testimonies are so plain and convincing, that all learned men who have exactly considered this matter, as well Papists as Protestants, are agreed that this was the ancient and general practice of the Church, to confirm infants as soon as they were baptized. For so I find not only Baluzius, but Peter de Marca[19], Hugo Menardus[20], Maldonat[21], Estius[22],

p. 697 b. 18.) Pontifex, ... elevata et imposita manu super capita omnium, det orationem super eos cum invocatione septiformis gratiæ Spiritus Sancti.... Ibid. (c. 14.) Tincto pollice in chrismate, faciat crucem in frontibus singulorum, ita dicendo, Confirmo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.

[17] L. 1. c. 69. Ex Pontificali Vet. MS. (p. 551.) Statim autem confirmetur infans, et communicetur ab episcopo, ita dicente, *Corpus et sanguis Domini.*—Item ex altero Pontificali. (p. 552.) Si episcopus adest, statim confirmari eum oportet chrismate, et postea communicari.

[18] Ep. de Ordine Baptismi, ap. Baluz. ibid. (p. 552.).... Post trinam mersionem episcopus puerum chrismate confirmet in fronte, novissime autem corpore et sanguine Christi confirmetur seu communicetur, ut Christi membrum esse possit.

[19] Not. ad C. Claramont. p. 312. [This citation is indistinct, though it is probably correct according to the Ed. Paris. 1663, which the Author consulted. Grischovius, the translator of the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* into Latin, complains that he could find nothing to the purpose in the *Notæ ad C. Claramont.*, according to the Ed. Francofurt. 1708, which he used, and I have also at hand: and truly I cannot discover any express statement of the confirmation of infants immediately after baptism; but the inference may justly be drawn from various remarks in the disquisition, (append. p. 268.) beginning at the words, *Hic locus me admonet, &c.;* where De Marca dwells upon the meaning of an ambiguous canon of the Council of Orange with respect to the use of chrism in baptism, and in confirmation, if omitted in baptism. See also the context (p. 270.) commencing, *Attamen quoniam in illis novi decreti* [*scil. Canonis Arausicani*] *ex-*

and Galenus[23], among the Papists, and Bishop Taylor[24] and Daille[25], among the Protestants, readily consenting: and some[26] tell us, the same practice continues among the Greeks to this day. The learned reader may add to the former testimonies the authority of St. Austin, who witnesses for this practice in his own person; for he says[27] he himself was used

ordiis accidere poterat, ut casu aliquo omitteretur in baptismo chrismatis unctio, ea de re commonendum episcopum docent [*Patres Arausicani,*] *quod ad consignandos infantes accedit* [*leg. accedât*], *&c.* See also further on (p. 275.) where De Marca cites Gregory's Book of Sacraments;—*Pontifex vero veniens ad infantes,* (id est, recens baptizatos,) *tenente archidiacono chrisma, involutis scapulis et brachiis ex panno lineo, et levata manu super capita omnium, dicit: Omnipotens, &c.... Et, interrogantibus diaconibus nomina singulorum, pontifex tincto pollice in chrismate facit crucem in fronte unius, similiter per omnes singillatim.* These passages are sufficient for De Marca's testimony to the practice of confirming infants by the bishop immediately after the presbyter had baptized them. Ed.]

20 Not. ad Libr. Sacrament. p. 144. (ap. Oper. Greg. in t. 3. part. 1. p. 357 a. 3.) Nec soli adulti, sed etiam ipsi infantes, simul cum baptismo sumebant eucharistiæ sacramentum, &c. [Conf. ibid. (d 2.) Ita apud Alcuinum, &c. Ed.]

21 De Confirmat. quæst. 2. (t. 1. p. 115.) Quando autem confirmari debeant baptizati, ea in re laudabilior consuetudo est ecclesiæ hodiernæ, quam veteris: nam in ecclesia veteri statim post baptismum confirmatio et eucharistia dabantur, etiam infantibus: nunc autem merito exspectatur illud tempus, quo tempore possint baptizati confiteri fidem suam.

22 Sentent. l. 4. distinct. 7. s. 23. (t. 4. p. 101 c.)... Cum enim nemo Catholicorum dubitet parvulos sicut baptismi, ita et confirmationis capaces esse, &c.

23 Catechism. ap. Dall. de Confirmat. c. 3. (p. 21. post med.) Debet hoc sacramentum etiam pueris infantibusque conferri; de quibus pessime merentur, qui in septimum vel decimum annum differunt. Cum enim ea vis, quam diximus, exserat sese in eos omnes, qui non obturent rivos fluentis gratiæ; profecto iis omnibus chrismatibus infantes spoliat, tantumque cœlestis gloriæ detrahit, quibus properata morte præreptis noluit hoc dari sacramentum, quantum beneficiorum Christi per hoc labrum eis communicari vetuit.

24 Worthy Communicant, ch. 3. s. 2. p. 209. (Works, v. 15. p. 502.) The Primitive Church, &c.

25 De Confirmat. l. 3. c. 13. p. 386.) Apud istos veteres .... episcopus cujuscunque baptismo aderat, et eum extempore manus impositione et chrismate confirmabat: quo fiebat, ut plurimi in singulis parœciis confirmationem cum baptismo simul et semel acciperent. Solemne enim erat et adultos catechumenos, et parvulos etiam fidelium liberos, nisi imminentis a morbo mortis necessitas aliter fieri cogeret, omnes duobus tantum anni temporibus baptizari, Paschate et Pentecoste. Quod in episcopali ecclesia, nisi præsente episcopo, non fiebat. Cum ergo quos baptizari fas erat, ii illuc ex civitate pene omnes concurrerent, plurimi, quod dixi, una cum baptismo chrismatis confirmationem accipiebant. Qui vero in remotioribus parœciæ ecclesiis, puta in vicis, et castellis, et pagis, a presbyteris solis baptizati et chrismati erant, ii quam primum ab episcopo confirmabantur, vel ad ipsos ea de causa excurrente, vel certe ad eum ipsi venientes, aut, si parvuli essent, delati.

26 Peter du Moulin, Buckler of Faith, (p. 381.) The supplement of Philastrius, &c.

27 Tract. 6. in 1 Ioan. 3. t. 9. p.

to give imposition of hands, or confirmation, to infants, that they might receive the Holy Spirit.

And, secondly, from the custom of giving the eucharist to infants for many ages.

3. If this matter needed further proof, we might insist upon that known practice and custom in the ancient Church, of giving the eucharist to infants, which continued in the Church for several ages. It is frequently mentioned in Cyprian, Austin, Innocentius, and Gennadius, writers from the third to the fifth century. Maldonat confesses it was in the Church for six hundred years. And some of the authorities just now alleged prove it to have continued two or three ages more, and to have been the common practice beyond the time of Charles the Great. Now all men know, that in the common course of things confirmation always preceded the eucharist, unless there was some special cause, as sometimes it happened in the case of clinic baptism, or the bishop's absence, to prevent it. For in these two cases the eucharist was many times given before confirmation, as now it is in our large dioceses, where the bishop's presence cannot always be had to give confirmation, in places at a great distance, before the communion: but in all other cases the usual way was to let confirmation usher in the communion. And therefore since it is evident that the communion itself was given to infants, and that immediately from the time of their baptism, it would be reasonable to conclude from hence, were there no other evidence, that confirmation also was given to infants together with baptism, because this rite by all ordinary rules and custom was prior and introductory to the communion.

Whence it appears, that confirmation was not esteemed a proper sacrament distinct from baptism.

4. This observation may help us to understand some difficult passages in the Ancients, and answer an objection which the Romanists draw from them, as if confirmation were a proper sacrament distinct from baptism.

The Ancients, it must be owned, sometimes give it the name of *a sacrament*, and call baptism and confirmation *two sacraments*. But then it is very evident they take the word *sacrament* in a large sense for any sacred ceremony, rite, or mystery belonging to baptism: in which sense they suppose two sacra-

254. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 868 d.) Quando imposuimus manum istis infantibus, attendit unusquisque vestrum utrum linguis loquerentur? Et cum videret eos linguis non loqui, ita perverso corde aliquis vestrum fuit, ut diceret, Non acceperunt isti Spiritum Sanctum?

ments, or chief mysterious ceremonies to be in baptism, that is, the immersion in water, and the unction with the holy chrism; both which are spoken of as sacraments or ceremonies belonging to baptism. Thus in the Council of Carthage under Cyprian[28], Nemesianus à Tubunis says, 'It was not sufficient for men to be regenerated only by imposition of hands, but they ought to be born again by both the sacraments in the Catholic Church;' that is, as well by washing in water, as imposition of hands, both which he makes *sacraments*, that is, sacred rites of the same sacrament of regeneration. In the same sense Cyprian himself[29] says 'both the sacraments of regeneration were required to complete men's sanctification.' Which plainly shows that by *two sacraments* he means no more but two of the principal ceremonies that belonged to a complete and perfect baptism, because he says, 'men were regenerated or born again by them both.' In like manner Optatus makes imposition of hands and unction to be only parts and ceremonies completing baptism. For, speaking of the baptism of Christ, he says[30], 'He went not into the water, as if any thing in God could need cleansing; but it was necessary the water should go before the unction that was to follow after, to initiate and order and complete the mysteries or sacramental rites of baptism. When he was washed by the hands of John, the order of the mystery was settled; the Father fulfilled what the Son had asked, and what the Holy Ghost had foretold. The spiritual oil immediately descended in the image of a dove, and sate upon his head, and anointed him; from whence he began to be called Christ, because he was anointed of God the Father. And that imposition of hands might not seem to be wanting, the voice of God was heard from the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!' Here Optatus professes to describe the order and parts and mysteries

[28] N. 5. p. 231. (p. 159.) Male ergo sibi quidam interpretantur, ut dicant, quod per manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum accipiant, et sic recipiantur: cum manifestum sit utroque sacramento debere eos renasci in Ecclesia Catholica.

[29] Ep. 72. ad Stephan. p. 196. (p. 305.)... Eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad recipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, nisi accipiant et ecclesiæ baptismum. Tunc enim demum plene sanctificari et esse filii Dei possint, si sacramento utroque nascantur.

[30] L. 4. p. 81. (p. 94.) See before, s. 1. n. 9, preceding.

of baptism, from the similitude of the baptism of Christ. In each of these he makes three sacraments or principal mysteries, the washing, the unction, and imposition of hands: which are not properly three distinct sacraments, but three parts or rites of the same sacrament of baptism, which, according to Optatus, were ordered, and shadowed, and completed in the baptism of Christ. Unless we take the word *sacrament* in this large sense, we shall have three proper sacraments in baptism; which neither Optatus nor any of the Ancients ever thought of when they speak of the mysteries of baptism; but they allow both unction and imposition of hands to be sacraments, as they are parts or rites of the mystery of baptism. After this manner Pacianus[31], bishop of Barcelona, makes also three sacraments of the mystery of baptism, viz. the laver or washing of water, the unction of the Spirit, and the hand and mouth of the priest. For he says, 'The seed of Christ, that is the Spirit of God, brings forth a new man, by the hands of the priest, out of the womb of the Church, which is the font, faith being the bride-maid to all this. And without these three sacraments, the laver, the chrism, and the priest, this new birth is not effected. For by the laver sin is purged away; by the chrism the Holy Spirit is poured down upon us; and both these we obtain by the hand and mouth of the priest; and so the whole man is regenerated and renewed in Christ.' Here we must of necessity say, either that the laver, the chrism, and words and action of the priest, are three sacraments: or else, that they are but three parts or ceremonies of the same sacrament of baptism. Which is what Pacian plainly intended; for he is speaking of the manner how men are regenerated in baptism, and he makes chrism to be one means of this regeneration; whence it is evident he had no other notion of it, but as of an integral part of baptism, though not absolutely essential to it.

[31] Serm. de Bapt. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 3. p. 77. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 275 a.) Christi semen, id est, Dei Spiritus, novum hominem, alvo [matris agitatum, et partu fontis exceptum, manibus] sacerdotis effundit, fide tamen pronuba...Hæc autem compleri alias nequeunt, nisi lavacri et chrismatis et antistitis sacramento. Lavacro enim peccata purgantur, chrismate Sanctus Spiritus superfunditur; utraque vero ista manu et ore antistitis impetramus, atque ita totus homo renascitur et innovatur in Christo.

This then is one plain reason why the Ancients sometimes call the immersion in the water, and the unction of chrism, *two sacraments*, because they are parts, or rites, or ceremonies of the mystery of baptism. And there is nothing more usual with the Ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite or ceremony used in the Church by the name of *a sacrament* or *mystery*. As St. Austin[32] calls exorcism *a sacrament*. And the salt, which was given to the catechumens before baptism, is called *the sacrament of the catechumens*, both by St. Austin[33] and the third Council of Carthage, as has been observed in another place[34], where I speak particularly of this sacrament of the catechumens. Cyprian[35] speaks of 'sacraments in the Lord's Prayer.' And to insist no longer upon these, it is usual also with the Ancients to divide the proper sacraments, baptism and the eucharist, each of them into two or more, meaning the several parts or rites belonging to them. Thus Isidore[36] speaks of 'four sacraments in the Church, which are, baptism, chrism, the body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.' As therefore the bread and wine are called *two sacraments*, though they be but two parts of the same eucharist; so the washing and the unction are called *two sacraments* though they be but two rites of the same sacrament of baptism. The like style is used by Pope Innocent[37] when he calls the bread and wine *sacraments* in the plural. And Fulbertus Carnotensis[38] is more express, when he says, 'There are two sacraments of life, the body and blood of Christ.' No

[32] Hom. 83. de Divers. [al. Serm. 227.] (t. 5. p. 973 e.) Sic et vos ante jejunii humiliatione et exorcismi sacramento quasi molebamini.

[33] De Peccat. Merit. l. 2. c. 26. See before, b. 10. ch. 2. s. 16. v. 4. p. 471. n. 24.

[34] See ibid. n. 26.

[35] De Orat. Domin. p. 142. (p. 101.) Qualia autem sunt ..... Orationis Dominicæ sacramenta, quam multa, quam magna, breviter in sermone collecta; sed in virtute spiritaliter copiosa, ut nihil omnino prætermissum sit, quod non in precibus atque orationibus nostris, cœlestis doctrinæ [compendio] comprehendatur.

[36] Origin. l. 6. c. 19. (p. 52 a.) Sunt autem sacramenta baptismus, et chrisma; corpus et sanguis Christi.

[37] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 5. (CC. t. 2. p. 1247 b.) Nec longe portanda sunt sacramenta.

[38] Ep. 1. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 3. p. 434. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 18. p. 3 f.) Tria nobis sunt ad profectum Christianæ religionis proposita... Horum primum est intelligere, et firmiter tenere mysterium Trinitatis et unius veritatem Deitatis; secundum, salutaris baptismi rationem nosse vel causam; tertium, in quo duo vitæ sacramenta, id est, Dominici corporis et sanguinis, continentur.

wonder therefore the same author[39] should call the immersion in water and the unction of chrism conveying the Spirit by the name of 'the two sacraments of baptism.' For nothing can be plainer, than that immersion and chrism are not properly two sacraments of baptism, but only two rites of it: as the bread and wine are not strictly two sacraments of the eucharist, but only different parts of the same communion.

It were easy to add abundance more of such expressions out of other authors, many of which the reader may find collected together by the learned Daille[40]. I shall only add the words of Haimo Haberstatensis[41], [or Haymo Halberstadiensis, who flourished about the middle of the ninth century,] where he expressly makes confirmation a rite or ceremony of baptism, always accompanying, and administered at the same time with it, as the consummating act and perfection of it: 'The gift of the Holy Spirit,' says he, 'is given in baptism by the imposition of the bishop's hands.' So that when the Ancients call confirmation *a sacrament*, they always mean, that it is a part or ceremony of the sacrament of baptism. In which sense they give the name of *a sacrament* to many other things, which were only parts, or ceremonies, or attendants on it, such as exorcism, and the sign of the cross, which were sacraments in the same sense as confirmation.

No, not when it was separate from baptism, as in the case of heretics, who were baptized out of the Church.

5. But it may be said, that confirmation, imposition of hands, or unction, was many times given to men at some years' distance from baptism; as in the case of heretics and schismatics, who were baptized in infancy out of the Church, and were received by imposition of hands, when they returned to the Church afterwards. To which I answer, that the imposition of hands, which the Church gave in this case separate from baptism, was what could not be avoided, because the Church had no opportunity of administering it before; and therefore

[39] Ibid. p. 436. (ibid. p. 4 e. 12.) Requiritur sane in baptismatis sacramentis aqua propter sepulturam, et Spiritus Sanctus propter vitam æternam.

[40] De Confirmat. l. 1. c. 8. (p. 150.) l. 3. c. 13. (p. 386.)

[41] In Hebr. 13., cited by Daille. de Confirmat. l. 3. c. 13. (p. 387.) Donum Spiritus Sancti datur in baptismate per impositionem manus episcoporum. [Conf. eund. in Hebr. 6, 2. ap. Dall. ibid. . . . . Per impositionem manuum plenissime creditur accepi donum Spiritus Sancti, quod post baptismum ad confirmationem unitatis in ecclesia Christi a pontificibus fieri solet. Ed.]

no argument is to be drawn from what she was forced to do upon such an exigence, being only an exception to her ordinary practice. It is owned, that the Church gave imposition of hands to all heretics upon their return to the Church: and this, as I have showed at large in another Discourse[42], was to supply the deficiencies of that outward form of baptism, which could not grant them the graces of the Spirit, whilst they remained in heresy or schism. And there I also observed, that some heretics retained the unction and imposition of hands as well as baptism, and administered it to infants together with baptism: which was the practice of the Donatists, and it may be, of several others. But yet the Church, though she neither repeated the outward form of baptism, nor always the unction of chrism; especially in the western parts, where St. Austin, Optatus, Alcimus, and Avitus lived; yet she always gave a new imposition of hands with prayer, to implore the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. And though this was separating confirmation from baptism, yet it was only in an extraordinary case, when the Church was not capacitated to do otherwise. In other cases she always joined these two ceremonies together, as well in infants as adult persons, as I suppose the allegations and proofs alleged in this chapter, do abundantly show to any candid reader beyond possibility of contradiction.

No necessity of giving confirmation to infants now, any more than the eucharist, from the example of the primitive Church.

6. But some will be apt to object, that, if this were the case, then all Churches at present, as well Protestant as Popish, differ from the practice of the primitive Church in this particular, that now they never administer confirmation to infants, but only to adult persons, who can confirm their baptismal vow in their own persons. And this difference is readily owned, as to practice. But then if the question be about right, which is the more suitable and agreeable practice? and, whether we ought not to conform in every circumstance to the practice of the primitive Church? I suppose every Church in this case is best judge for herself, what is most for the edification of her children. And as no Church now thinks herself under any obligation to give the eucharist to infants, because the primitive Church for eight hundred years did so: so neither does

[42] Scholast. Hist. of Lay Baptism, ch. 1. s. 21. [Originally published in 1712. and now reprinted in the ninth volume of this edition. Ed.]

any Church judge herself bound to give confirmation to infants from the same example. Though some learned persons have pleaded for both, as Bishop Bedel[43] among the Protestants for the communion of infants, and Matthew Galen[44] among the Papists for giving them confirmation. Whilst others judge the modern practice the more edifying way, and think there are no sufficient arguments to engage the Church to make an alteration.

CHAP. II.

Of the minister of confirmation.

The consecration of chrism reserved only to the office of bishops by the canons.

1. Next to the persons, to whom confirmation was given, we are to make inquiry about the ministry of it, and see by whom it was usually given. And here it will be necessary to distinguish the several parts and ceremonies of confirmation, and cases ordinary and extraordinary; as also the consecration of the chrism from the use of it, and the practice and custom of some Churches from others: for one rule was not precisely observed in all these.

Confirmation consisted of several acts. as we shall see in the next chapter. There was first the consecration of the chrism, which was always the bishop's act; then there was the unction itself, or the use of it with consignation, or the sign of the cross, on the forehead or other parts of the body; then imposition of hands with prayer. There were also cases ordinary, when the bishop was present at baptism; and cases extraordinary when he was absent, and the party in danger of death. There were also different practices according to the rules of the different Churches: and according to these distinctions the answer must be given to this general question. The consecration of the chrism was generally reserved to the

[43] See Bishop Usher's Letters, Lett. 163. p. 442. (Works, [Lett. 173.] v. 13. p. 519.) By this doctrine you must also maintain that children do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, if they receive the eucharist, as for divers ages they did, and perhaps ought, since they do not *ponere obicem contrariæ cogitationis aut pravæ operationis.* And since the use of this sacrament *toties quoties* must needs confer grace, it seems it were necessary to let them communicate, and the oftener the better, to the intent they might be stronger in grace.

[44] Catechism. ap. Dall. de Confirmat. l. 1. c. 3. See before, s. 2. n. 23, preceding.

bishop in all Churches, and so the use of it was derived from his authority in all cases whatsoever. The second Council of Carthage[45] forbids presbyters to have any concern in it, and refers to a former Council, wherein the like prohibition was made before. The third Council of Carthage[46] allows presbyters by the commission of the bishop to consecrate virgins, but never to consecrate the chrism. The fourth Council of Carthage[47] obliges presbyters in country churches to go to the bishop yearly before Easter, or else to send their sacrist to him for the chrism. In some Churches of Spain, the presbyters took upon them to consecrate it themselves; which occasioned the first Council of Toledo[48] to renew the decree against this as an usurpation, forbidding any beside the bishop to do it from that day forward, and obliging presbyters, as before, to go to their own bishop for it before Easter. The like injunctions are made in the first Council of Vaison[49], the Council of Auxerre[50], the Council of Barcelona[51], the first and second Councils of Bracara[52], and in the Collection of Greek Canons

[45] C. 3. (t. 2. p. 1160 a.) Nam memini præterito Concilio fuisse statutum, ut chrisma, vel reconciliatio pœnitentium, nec non et puellarum consecratio a presbyteris non fiant.

[46] C. 36. (ibid. p. 1172 b.) Ut presbyter, inconsulto episcopo, virgines non consecret, chrisma vero nunquam conficiat.

[47] C. 36. (ibid. p. 1203 b.) Presbyteri, qui per diœceses ecclesias regunt, non a quibuslibet episcopis, sed a suis, nec per minorem [al. juniorem] clericum, sed omni anno aut per seipsos, aut per illum qui sacrarium tenet, ante Paschæ solennitatem chrisma petant.

[48] C. 20. (ibid. p. 1226 d.) Quamvis pene ubique custodiatur, ut absque episcopo chrisma nemo conficiat, tamen quia in aliquibus locis vel provinciis, presbyteri dicuntur chrisma conficere, placuit, ex hac die nullum alium nisi episcopum chrisma conficere, [al. facere,] et per diœcesim destinare; ita ut de singulis ecclesiis ad episcopum ante diem Paschæ diaconi destinentur, aut subdiaconi, qui [al. ut] confectum chrisma ab episcopo destinatum ad diem Paschæ possint ad tempus deferre. [al. possit occurrere.]

[49] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1457 c.) Per singula territoria presbyteri, vel ministri, ab episcopis, non, prout libitum fuerit, a vicinioribus, sed a suis propriis, per annos singulos chrisma petant, appropinquante solennitate paschali, etc.

[50] C. 6. (t. 5. p. 958 b.) Ut a media quadragesima presbyteri chrisma petant.

[51] C. 2. (ibid. p. 1605 d.) Simili statutum conditione est, ut, cum chrisma presbyteris diœcesanis pro neophytis confirmandis datur, nihil pro liquoris pretio accipiatur.

[52] Bracar. 1. c. 37. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 19.] (ibid. p. 842 b.) Placuit, si quis presbyter, post hoc interdictum, ausus fuerit chrisma benedicere, aut ecclesiam aut altarium consecrare, a suo officio deponatur.—Bracar. 2. [al. 3.] c. 4. (ibid. p. 897 c.) Placuit, ut modicum balsami, quod, benedictum pro baptismi sacramento, per ecclesias datur, &c.

made by Martin Bracarensis[53]; as also in the Roman Decrees made by Popes Innocent[54], Leo[55], and Gelasius[56], which I need not repeat at length upon this occasion. So that by this means the bishop's authority was secured, even in such cases where presbyters were allowed to have their share in this holy unction.

The use of the chrism divided between the office of bishops and presbyters.

2. Now this unction or consignation in many Churches, particularly in the Roman Church, was distinguished into two sorts, the consignation of the forehead, and the consignation of the other parts of the body. And the former in such Churches, where this distinction was made, was generally reserved to the bishop to be administered with imposition of hands; but the latter was given by presbyters also. All Churches did not allow of this distinction of chrism into two sorts, but such as did allow of two, granted authority to presbyters to administer the one but not the other.

The double chrismation was first brought in by Pope Innocent, and he thus divides the office between bishops and presbyters. 'A presbyter,' says he[57], 'baptizing either in the bishop's presence or absence, may anoint the baptized party with chrism, provided it be consecrated beforehand by the bishop, but he may not sign him in the forehead with the same oil, because it belongs to bishops only when they give the Holy Ghost.' And so it is in the Decrees of Gelasius[58], and Pope Gregory[59] his successor in the Roman see. But this

[53] C. 51. (CC. ibid. p. 911 d.) Omni tempore episcopis liceat chrisma conficere, et per suas diœceses destinare; ita ut ad dirigendum chrisma diaconus, aut subdiaconus, ante diem Paschæ, de singulis ecclesiis ad episcopum destinentur.

[54] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1246 c.) Presbyteris . . chrismate baptizatos unguere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum.

[55] Ep. 88. ad Gall. (CC. t. 3. p. 1395 c.). . Nec erigere eis [presbyteris et diaconis] altaria, nec ecclesias vel altaria consecrare licet, nec per impositiones manuum fidelibus baptizandis, vel conversis ex hæresi, Paracletum Spiritum Sanctum tradere, nec chrisma conficere, &c.

[56] Ep. 9. ad Episcopos Lucaniæ, c. 6. (CC. t. 4. p. 1189 e.) Presbyteros ultra modum suum tendere prohibemus: nec episcopali fastigio debita sibimet audacter assumere: non conficiendi chrismatis, non consignationis pontificalis adhibendæ, sibimet arripere facultatem.

[57] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1246 c.) Presbyteris, seu extra episcopum, seu præsente episcopo, baptizant, chrismate baptizato ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis, cum tradant Spiritum [Sanctum] Paracletum.

[58] Ep. 9. c. 6. See n. 56, preceding.

[59] L. 3. Ep. 9. See before, ch. 1. s. 2. p. 199. n. 14.

double chrismation was not received in France, nor in any of the Eastern Churches. In France it was the office of presbyters, and the imposition of hands was only reserved to the bishop. This is undeniably evident from the Council of Orange[60], which orders 'every minister who had received the office of baptizing, wherever he went, to have the chrism with him; because it was agreed, that chrism should only be once used in baptism: but if by any necessity it had been omitted in baptism, then the bishop should be put in mind of that omission in confirmation. For it was agreed to have only one chrismation.' This canon is repeated and referred to again in the second Council of Arles[61], and Valesius[62] adds to them an inscription in Gruter, confirming the same thing, that the bishop did not minister the chrism, except it had been omitted by the presbyter before.

In the Eastern Churches they had but one unction after baptism, and that performed by the bishop, except in some particular and extraordinary cases. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions[63] makes this the office of the bishop to anoint those that were baptized with the holy chrism. And this, he says[64], 'was the confirmation of the professions which they had made in baptism.' The author under the name of Dionysius[65] says the same, 'that after the presbyters have

[60] Arausican. 1. c. 1. (t. 3. p. 1447 e.) Nullus ministrorum, qui baptizandi recipit officium, sine chrismate usquam debet progredi, quia inter nos placuit semel in baptismate chrismari. De eo autem, qui in baptismate, quacunque necessitate faciente, non chrismatus fuerit, in confirmatione sacerdos commonebitur. Nam inter nos chrismatis ipsius non nisi una benedictio est.

[61] C. 27. (t. 4. p. 1014 b.) Nullum ministrum, qui baptizandi recepit officium, sine chrismate usquam debere progredi, quia inter nos juxta synodi constitutionem, placuit semel chrismari.

[62] Not. in Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 313. n. 4.) Porro hæc baptizatorum consignatio interdum fiebat cum chrismate: quoties scilicet aliquis, urgente morbi necessitate, baptizatus fuerat a minoribus clericis, nec chrismatus. Tunc enim episcopus, qui baptismi solemnia postmodum supplebat, chrismare simul et manus imponere necesse habebat. Qui vero perfectum baptismum acceperant, iis manus tantum imponebatur ab episcopo sine chrismatione, ut docet Canon Arausicanus: quo pertinet vetus Epigramma apud Gruterum (p. 1177.) de Marea

Tuque sacerdotes docuisti, chrismate sancto
Tangere bis nullum judice posse Deo.

[63] L. 3. c. 16. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 288.) . . *Μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος χρίετω τοὺς βαπτισθέντας τῷ μύρῳ.*

[64] Ibid. c. 17. (p. ead.) *Τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας.*—L. 7. c. 43. [Labb. c. 44.] (Cotel. ibid. p. 381.) . . . *Βαπτίσας αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, χρισάτω μύρῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

[65] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. part 2. n. 7. p. 254. (t. 1. p. 169 d.) *Ἐπὶ τὸν*

baptized a man, they bring him to the bishop, and he anoints him with the divine chrism, and pronounces him capable of partaking of the holy eucharist.' Now this episcopal unction was not only in the forehead, as was usual in the Roman Church, but in all other parts of the body. For, as Cyril of Jerusalem[66] tells those that were baptized, 'they were first anointed in the forehead, to wipe away that shame, which the first man by his transgression had contracted; and that they might now with open face behold the glory of the Lord. Then they were anointed on the ears, that they might have ears to hear the divine mysteries; after that, on the nose and breast, that they might be a sweet savour unto the Lord, and, being armed with the breastplate of righteousness, might be able to withstand all the insults of the Devil.' Thus also all such heretics as were to be received into the Church without rebaptization, as having been baptized in due form before, are appointed[67] 'to be received by consignation or unction of the holy chrism; first on the forehead, then on the eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, with this form of words, The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.'

But though this whole ceremony of unction in the Eastern Church was ordinarily to be performed only by the bishop, and not divided, as in the Roman, between the bishop and presbyters; yet in some special cases, in some particular Churches this office devolved upon the presbyters. For at Alexandria, if the bishop was absent, it was usual for the presbyters to give this consignation at the same time that they baptized. As I

ἱεράρχην αὖθις ἀπάγουσιν· ὁ δὲ, τῷ θεουργικωτάτῳ μύρῳ τὸν ἄνδρα σφραγισάμενος, μέτοχον ἀποφαίνει λοιπὸν τῆς ἱεροτελεστικωτάτης εὐχαριστίας.

66 Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 3. [al. 4.] (p. 317 b.) *Πρῶτον ἐχρίεσθε ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον, ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῆτε τῆς αἰσχύνης, ἣν ὁ πρῶτος παραβάτης ἄνθρωπος πανταχοῦ περιέφερε, καὶ ἵνα ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτρίζησθε· εἶτα, ἐπὶ τὰ ὦτα, ἵνα προσλάβητε τὰ ἀκουστικὰ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ὦτα, περὶ ὧν Ἠσαΐας ἔλεγε, Καὶ προσέθηκέ μοι Κύριος ὠτίον τῶν* [leg. *τοῦ*] *ἀκούειν· καὶ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν εὐαγγελίοις, Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω· εἶτα, ἐπὶ τὴν ὄσφρησιν, ὅπως τοῦ θείου ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι μύρου λέγητε, Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις· μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐπὶ τὰ στήθη, ἵνα, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, στῆτε πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ Διαβόλου.*

67 C. Constant. 1. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 a.) *Τοὺς προστιθεμένους τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ καὶ τῇ μερίδι τῶν σωζομένων ἀπὸ αἱρετικῶν δεχόμεθα . . . σφραγιζομένους, ἤτοι χριομένους πρῶτον τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ τό, τε μέτωπον, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὰ ὦτα· καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν, Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.*

think the words of the author under the name of St. Ambrose[68] are to be understood, when he says, 'that in Egypt the presbyters consign in the bishop's absence.' And this another author under the name of St. Austin[69] calls *consecration;* which some learned persons, I know, take for the consecration of the eucharist. But that was nothing singular, but common to all the world, for presbyters to consecrate the eucharist in the bishop's absence in all Churches, and therefore needed not to be noted as a peculiar custom in Egypt. Therefore I rather judge it to mean some consecration, which presbyters in many other Churches were not allowed in the absence of the bishop, as the consecrating or consigning such as were baptized with the chrism of confirmation, which a presbyter might not do in the Roman Churches. But in some of the Eastern Churches this was allowed, for the author of the Constitutions[70], speaking of the celebration of baptism, addresses himself both to bishops and presbyters, telling them in what order they should perform it: 'Thou, bishop, or presbyter, shalt first anoint the party to be baptized with the holy oil; then thou shalt baptize him with water; and last of all thou shalt sign him with the holy chrism.' Where we see not only the unction preceding baptism, but that which followed after, which was the unction of confirmation, is commanded to the presbyter as well as the bishop; which must at least be interpreted to mean his doing it in the absence of the bishop; or in his presence, if he has a particular command and delegation. So that, as to what concerned this first ceremony of confirmation, the unction of chrism, the practice of different Churches varied much upon it. Some Churches, as the Roman, divided the office between bishops and presbyters. Others, as those of France, committed it wholly to presbyters, reserving to the bishop only the consecration of the oil, and imposition of hands in confirmation. Others, as those of the East, reserved not only the consecration

[68] In Eph. 4, 11. (t. 2. append. p. 241 f.) Denique apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus.

[69] Quæst. in Vet. et Nov. Test. q. 101. (t. 3. append. p. 93 a.)... In Alexandria, et per totam Ægyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat [MS. Colb. *consignat*] presbyter.

[70] L. 7. c. 22. [Labb. c. 23.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 368.) Ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, ἢ πρεσβύτερε ... χρίσεις δὲ πρῶτον ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ, ἔπειτα βαπτίσεις ὕδατι, καὶ τελευταῖον σφραγίσεις μύρῳ.

of the chrism, but the use of it to the bishop entirely, when he was personally present, and in all ordinary cases; only allowing it to be used by presbyters in his absence, or some such extraordinary cases.

The other ceremony of imposition of hands reserved more strictly to the office of bishops.

3. As to the other ceremony of imposition of hands in confirmation, we find that more universally and strictly reserved to the office of bishops; yet not so absolutely and entirely, but that the canons authorized presbyters to do it in subordination to their bishop in some certain cases. It is certain Cyprian[71] speaks of it as the ordinary office of bishops or chief ministers of the Church. For, mentioning the imposition of hands given by the Apostles, to those whom Philip had baptized, (Acts 8, 17.) he says, 'The same custom was now observed in the Church, that those, who were baptized, were presented to the governors of the Church, that by their prayer and imposition of hands they might receive the Holy Ghost, and be consummated with the seal of the Lord.' In like manner Firmilian[72], bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was cotemporary with Cyprian, makes bishops the ordinary ministers of this office, whilst he draws a comparison between St. Paul giving imposition of hands to those whom he baptized at Ephesus, (Acts 19, 6.) and the bishop's giving imposition of hands to such as returned from heresy or schism to the unity of the Catholic Church. So likewise the Anonymous Author[73], who writes of Baptism of Heretics, at the end of St. Cyprian's works, makes imposition of hands the office of bishops, in imitation of the Apostles giving imposition of hands to those who were baptized by Philip, the deacon. (Acts 8, 17.) And in another place[74] he says,

[71] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 202. (p. 308.) Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut, qui in ecclesia baptizantur, præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consummentur.

[72] Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 221. (p. 322.) Nisi si his episcopis, de quibus nunc, minor fuit Paulus; ut hi quidem possint per solam manus impositionem venientibus hæreticis dare Spiritum Sanctum; Paulus autem idoneus non fuerit, qui a Ioanne baptizatus Spiritum Sanctum per manus impositionem daret, nisi eos prius etiam ecclesiæ baptismo baptizasset.

[73] De Bapt. Hæreticorum, ap. Cypr. p. 23. in append. (p. 21.)... Per manus impositionem episcopi datur unicuique credenti Spiritus Sanctus, sicut Apostoli circa Samaritanos post Philippi baptisma manum eis imponendo fecerunt.

[74] Ibid. p. 26. (p. 24.) Et ideo, cum salus nostra in baptismate Spiritus, quod plerumque cum baptismate aquæ conjunctus sit, constituta,

'If bishops were present at baptism, they gave imposition of hands together with baptism; but if any were baptized by the inferior clergy, in time of necessity, then the bishops supplied this afterwards, or else the Lord supplied it as he saw fit.' The Council of Eliberis not long after made two canons to this purpose. In one[75] of which it is ordered, 'that if a layman baptized a catechumen, when he was dangerously sick at sea, or where there was no church near at hand, he should afterward bring him to the bishop, that he might perfect his baptism by imposition of hands.' And in the other canon[76] it is also ordered, 'that in case a deacon governing a country-people, where there is no bishop or presbyter present, shall baptize any of them, the bishop shall afterward perfect them by his benediction. Or if they chanced to die before this could be done, they were to be reputed in a salvable condition, by the faith in which they were baptized.'

We have heard St. Jerom before[77] testifying of this, as the general practice of the Church, for bishops to go about the country villages and remoter places in their dioceses, to give imposition of hands to such as were baptized by presbyters and deacons: and some of these died before the bishop could come to them; which implies, not only that it was the bishop's ordinary office, but that presbyters and deacons did not administer imposition of hands, even in such cases of necessity; otherwise the party who wanted it, could not have died without it. This was evidently the practice of the Roman Church, where, though the office of chrismation was in part allowed to presbyters, yet the consignation in the forehead with imposition of hands was still reserved to the bishop, as his peculiar office in confirma-

siquidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre et solenniter et per omnia, quæ scripta sunt, assignetur, atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut suppleatur a nobis, aut a Domino supplendum reservetur.

[75] C. 38. (t. 1. p. 974 e.) Peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate positum catechumenum: ita ut, si supervixerit, ad episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perficere [al. proficere] possit.

[76] C. 77. (ibid. p. 978 e.) Si quis diaconus, regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit. Quod si ante de sæculo recesserint, sub fide, qua quis crediderit, poterit esse justus.

[77] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. See before, ch. 1. s. 1. p. 196. n. 1.

tion: as we learn from the Letters of Popes Innocent[78], Gelasius[79], and Gregory the Great[80], which have already been mentioned in the last section: to which we may add the testimony of Cornelius, who lived before all these in the time of Cyprian, as it is recorded by Eusebius. He there[81], speaking of Novatian, who was baptized only with clinic baptism upon a sick bed, says, 'when he recovered from his distemper, he never received those things, which by the laws of the Church he was obliged to receive, to wit, consignation by the hand of the bishop, &c.' All those testimonies likewise, which require heretics to have imposition of hands from the bishop, in order to obtain the gift of the Holy Ghost, are a further evidence of this practice. To which purpose we have the Decrees of Popes Leo[82] and Siricius[83], who particularly observes this to have been the general practice of the whole Church, both Eastern and Western, as well as the Church of Rome, in the reception of those who had been baptized in any heresy or schism. And as to all persons baptized in the Church, St. Austin[84] is a further witness, who says, 'that in propriety of speech, neither the Apostles, nor any other man, but Christ alone, as he is God, could give the Holy Ghost: for the Apostles only laid hands on men, that the Holy Ghost by their prayers might descend upon them; which custom the Church now observed and practised by her bishops or governors also.' In like manner, St. Ambrose[85] says, 'The spiritual seal, or seal of the Spirit, which was the completion of baptism, came after the font, when by the prayer of the priest, (that is, in

[78] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 3. See s. 2. n. 57, preceding.

[79] Ep. 9. ad Episcopos Lucaniæ, c. 8. See ibid. n. 56, preceding.

[80] L. 3. Ep. 9. See ibid. n. 59, preceding.

[81] L. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 513. 13.) ... Οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτυχε, διαφυγὼν τὴν νόσον, ὧν χρῆ μεταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, τοῦ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

[82] Ep. 37. ad Leon. Raven. c. 2. (CC. t. 3. p. 1316 c.) Quod si ab hæreticis baptizatum quempiam fuisse constiterit ... hoc tantum, quod ibi defuit, conferatur, ut per episcopalem manus impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritus consequatur.

[83] Ep. 1. ad Himer. c. 1. (CC. t. 2. p. 1018 a.) ... Quos [Arianos] nos cum Novatianis ... per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus impositione Catholicorum conventui sociamus. Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidensque custodit.

[84] De Trinit. l. 15. c. 26. (t. 8. p. 999 a.) Neque enim aliquis discipulorum ejus dedit Spiritum Sanctum. Orabant quippe ut veniret in eos, quibus manum imponebant, non ipsi eum dabant. Quem morem in suis præpositis etiam nunc servat ecclesia.

[85] De Sacrament. l. 3. c. 2. See before, ch. 1. s. 1. p. 198. n. 8.

his language, the bishop,) the Holy Ghost was poured upon them.'

From all which testimonies it is most undeniably evident, that the bishop in all ordinary cases was the only standing and regular minister of this part of confirmation, which consisted in imposition of hands, and prayer to invocate the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Yet in some special cases, presbyters by commission allowed to minister it also. As, first, when bishops particularly required their presbyters to do it to such as were baptized in the Church.

4. Yet there were some special and extraordinary cases, in which some Churches, if not all, granted a license by canon to presbyters to minister this part of confirmation also. As when bishops, either in their presence or absence, appointed a presbyter by a particular delegation or command to do it. This was no encroachment upon the bishop's authority, nor infringement of his privilege and power, because what was done was only done in subordination to him, and in pursuance of his command. This license we find sometimes granted to presbyters, even in the bishop's presence. As is clear from that canon in the Collection of Martin Bracarensis[86], out of the canons of the Greek Church: 'A presbyter shall not consign infants in the presence of his bishop, unless it be particularly enjoined him by his bishop.' Here three things are manifestly implied: First, that this consignation, or imposition of hands with the sign of the cross and prayer, was ordinarily the sole office of the bishop. Secondly, that by a special commission he might authorize presbyters to do it even in his presence. Thirdly, that in his absence they were authorized to do it by a general commission, rather than infants or any other baptized persons should die without confirmation. And this agrees very well with what has been said before in the last section concerning the practice of the Churches of Alexandria and Egypt; though in the Western Churches it was otherwise, as is evident from what has been alleged before out of Pope Innocent[87] and St. Jerom[88], who tell us, 'that presbyters neither in the presence of the bishop nor in his absence were allowed to do it, but many men were forced to die without

[86] C. 52. (CC. t. 5. p. 911 d.) Presbyter, præsente episcopo, non signet infantes, nisi forte ab episcopo fuerit illi præceptum.

[87] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 3. See before, s. 1. n. 54, preceding.

[88] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. See before, ch. 1. s. 1. p. 196. n. 1.

confirmation or imposition of hands, because the bishop did not come time enough to administer it to them.'

Secondly, presbyters might administer to the energumens.

5. Yet also in the Western Churches there were some special cases in which this consignation was allowed to be performed by presbyters. Nay, and in one case by deacons also. As it was in the case of energumens, or persons possessed with evil spirits after baptism; concerning whom Pope Innocent makes this decree, in the same Epistle[89] where he prohibits presbyters from consigning in all ordinary cases: 'That if any one was seized with an evil spirit after baptism, the bishop might give orders to a presbyter or a deacon to consign him in that condition. It was not to be done but by the bishop's authority: for he only had the power of imposition of hands; but because an energumen who was at a great distance from the bishop might have several chances in his journey, it was therefore thought more proper for the bishops to grant a commission to a presbyter or deacon, to give him imposition of hands at home, than to venture his falling into his distemper, either by coming to the bishop or by returning.'

Thirdly, and to such as were baptized in heresy or schism, in case they were in danger of death.

6. Another extraordinary case in which this office of imposition of hands was granted to presbyters, was, when any, who had been baptized by heretics or schismatics, were upon their return to the Church seized with a violent sickness, and were in imminent danger of death, before they could go to the bishop, or the bishop come to them, to give them imposition of hands, and confirm them with that grace of the Spirit which they could not have in heresy or schism. In that case, rather than such persons should die without this office, a commission was granted to presbyters to administer it. This we find most expressly in the first Council of Orange[90]: 'Heretics, if they

[89] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 6. (CC. t. 2. p. 1247 c.) De his vero baptizatis, qui postea a dæmonio, aut vitio aliquo, aut peccato interveniente, arripiuntur, quæsivit dilectio tua, si a presbytero vel diacono possint aut debeant consignari? quod, hoc nisi episcopus concesserit, [al. episcopis præcipere] non licet: nam eis manus imponenda non est, nisi episcopus auctoritatem dederit id faciendi. Ut autem fiat, episcopi est imperare, ut manus eis [al. ei] vel a presbytero, vel a cæteris clericis imponatur. Nam quomodo id fieri sine magno labore poterit, ut longe constitutus energumenus ad episcopum deducatur, cum, si talis casus ei in itinere acciderit, nec perferri ad episcopum, nec referri ad sua facile possit?

[90] C. 1. (t. 3. p. 1447 b.) Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, a presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placuit.

be in extremity and apparent danger of death, when they desire to become Catholics, shall, in the bishop's absence, be consigned by the presbyters with chrism and benediction,' that is, imposition of hands in the benediction-prayer. And the like decree is made in the Council of Epone[91], 'that if any heretics who lay desperately sick upon a death-bed desired suddenly to be converted, in that case, for the salvation of their souls, which was heartily desired, a presbyter should be permitted to give them the consolation of chrism; for which they, that were in health, were to go to the bishop at their conversion.' Where we may observe, that the chrismation here spoken of was not the chrismation which presbyters were ordinarily allowed to give in the Western Church, but that which was joined with imposition of hands, which was peculiarly reserved to the bishop, except in those cases of extremity, when a presbyter was allowed to give it, rather than a converted heretic should die without it. And the reason of this concession was, because heretics, who were baptized out of the Church, were supposed to be without the grace of the Spirit, till they received it by imposition of hands in the Catholic Church. For which reason all heretics, as well those who used imposition of hands at baptism, as those that did not, received a new benediction when they returned to the unity of the Church; as I have showed from St. Austin[92], Optatus[93], and Alcimus Avitus[94] in another place[95].

[91] C. 16. (t. 4. p. 1578 b.) Presbytero, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus desperatis et in lecto recumbentibus hæreticis, si conversionem subitam petant, chrismate subvenire permittimus. Quod etiam omnes convertendi, si sani sunt, ab episcopo noverint expetendum.—Vid. Pontifical. Damasi, Vit. Silvestri, ap. Crabb. t. 1. p. 229. (ap. Labb. t. 1. p. 1408 e.) .... Et privilegium episcopis contulit, ut baptizatum consignent.

[92] De Bapt. l. 3. p. 16. See afterwards, ch. 3. s. 6. n. 25, following.

[93] L. 7. p. 109. [The citation is indistinct. The author seems to allude to the general spirit of the context: for example (p. 131) .... Si a vobis ad nos aliquis transitum fuerit: sic a nobis servatur, quomodo a vobis dimittitur .... Quod a vobis unctum est, tale servamus, quale suscipimus. .... Vos exterminastis in rebaptizatione suavitatem olei illius, quod in nomine Christi confectum est. Ed.]

[94] Ep. 24. ad Steph. (ap. Galland. t. 10. p. 720 c.) Quocirca Donatistarum nomen, ne diu in loco vivere possit alieno, benedictione protinus sepelite vitali. In ipso fomitis sui ortu peregrinantis igniculi frigescat incendium; de quo, ne vel famæ fumus narem Galliæ innocentis adspergat, manus impositionem personæ, de qua scriptis [leg. scribitis], adhibete, interdicta nominis ipsius in posterum, si ex corde convertitur, mentione, &c.

[95] See Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, part 1. ch. 1., near the end of s. 21.

CHAP. III.

Of the manner of administering confirmation, and the ceremonies used in the celebration of it.

The first ceremony of confirmation was the unction of chrism.

1. Having thus far considered both the subjects of confirmation, or the persons to whom it was administered, and the persons by whom it was administered, we are in the next place to take a view of the form and manner of its administration: in which we may observe four distinct ceremonies besides the consecration of the chrism; which were, the unction, the sign of the cross, imposition of hands, and prayer. The unction was commonly first in order, as we learn from that of Tertullian[95], 'As soon as we are come out of the water, we are anointed with the blessed unction;'—'and then we receive imposition of hands, invocating the Holy Spirit by a benediction.'

The original of this unction.

2. The first rise and original of this unction in the Church is not exactly known, and the sentiments of learned men are various about it. The late famous writer under the feigned name of Petrus Aurelius[96], in his Book called Orthodoxus, against Sirmond, takes a great deal of pains to prove it an apostolical practice. But Habertus[97] calls this 'a dream and a mad undertaking, against the general stream and current of learned men.' And Estius[98] says, 'The common opinion is, that the Apostles in the beginning of their preaching used no chrism in the administration of this sacrament,' as he calls it. So that what the Romanists now make the matter of their new sacrament is confessed to be without any foundation in Scripture. Bishop Pearson[99] is of opinion, that the use of it came into the Church shortly after the time of the Apostles. Bas-

[95] De Bapt. c. 7. See before, ch. 1. s. 1. p. 197. n. 3.

[96] [Jean Du Verger de Hauranne, L'abbé de Saint Cyran.—Opera, jussu et impensis Cleri Gallicani denuo in lucem edita, Paris. 1643. 3 tom. fol.—The Book against Sirmond forms the third volume of this edition. See Barbier's Dictionnaire des Anonymes, Paris. 1824. v. 3. p. 608. n. 21,162. Ed.]

[97] Archierat. ad Rit. Chrism. observ. 1. (p. 702.) Nam quod divininare quidam nos volunt, Apostolos in libro Praxapostolorum confirmasse cum chrismate, id rationem fugit. Præfracte id contra summos theologorum persuadere nititur Petrus Aurelius in Orthodoxo contra Sirmondum.

[98] In Sentent. l. 4. distinct. 7. s. 7. (t. 4. p. 88 b.) Communior sententia est, Apostolos initio suæ prædicationis non usos fuisse chrismate in administratione hujus sacramenti.

[99] In Act. Lect. 5. n. 6. p. 69. (ap. Oper. Posthum. Oxf. 1844. v. 1, p. 362.) Hinc certe profectus, &c.

nage[1] and Daille[2] think, not till the third century, when it is first mentioned by Origen[3] and Tertullian[4]. Some indeed allege an author more ancient than either of these, which is Theophilus Antiochenus[5], who says, 'that we are therefore called *Christians*, because we are *anointed* with the oil of God.' But the unction he speaks of is a spiritual and mystical unction; such as, he says, 'the whole air and earth under heaven is anointed with;' viz. the unction of light and the Spirit of God. So that there being no author before Tertullian, who mentions the material unction as used in confirmation, it is most probable it was a ceremony first begun about his time, to represent the unction of the Holy Ghost.

The form and manner of administering it, together with the effects of it.

3. But when it was once admitted, it was usually magnified as the symbol, and sometimes the instrumental cause of very great effects. The consecration of it was supposed to work a mystical change in its nature, answerable to the change wrought in the waters of baptism, and the bread and wine in the eucharist, which Cyril of Jerusalem[6] compares together. It was this unction, as the completion of baptism, to which they ascribed the power of making every Christian in some sense partaker of a royal priesthood. Which is not only said by Origen in the passage last mentioned, but by Pope Leo[7], St. Jerom[8], and many others[9]. To it they also ascribed the noble

[1] Exercit. in Baron. an. 35. (p. 76.) Nullus in consignandis fidelibus chrismatis usus ante tertium æræ Christianæ sæculum. Atque res apparet ex Tertulliano, qui chrisma in posterorum prospectum primus produxit.

[2] De Confirmat. l. 2. c. 2. (pp. 116, seqq.) Sed hæc est Bellarmini inverecundia, &c.

[3] In Levit. Hom. 9. p. 156. (t. 2. p. 243 b.) Omnes, quicunque unguento sacri chrismatis delibuti sunt, sacerdotes effecti sunt, sicut et Petrus ad omnem dicit ecclesiam, *Vos autem genus electum et regale sacerdotium.*

[4] De Bapt. c. 7. See b. 11. ch. 9. s. 1. p. 158. n. 62.

[5] Ad Autolycum, l. 1. ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 110. (ad calc. Just. Mart. p. 77 c.) . . . . Καλούμεθα Χριστιανοὶ, ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ.

[6] Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 3. (p. 316 d.) Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν, μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον.

[7] See before, b. 11. ch. 9. s. 6. p. 165. n. 91.

[8] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 2. [al. c. 4.] (t. 2. p. 174 a.) Deponat sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma: et ego do veniam pœnitenti; scriptum est enim, *Regnum quoque et sacerdotes Deo Patri suo fecit:* et iterum, *Gentem sanctam, regale sacerdotium, populum acquisitum.*

[9] Prosper, Sentent. ex August. n.

effects of confirming the soul with the strength of all spiritual graces on God's part, as well as the confirmation of the professions and covenant made on man's part. The author of the Constitutions[10] makes it to be on man's part βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας καὶ συνθηκῶν, *the confirmation of the confessions and compacts*, made with God in baptism; and on God's part, *the collation of the Holy Spirit*, represented by this ceremony of anointing. Which is so frequently mentioned in every Greek writer upon this subject, that it is superfluous to refer any learned reader to them. It will be sufficient only to hint the forms of prayer, which they used upon this occasion: for these will evidently show what spiritual effects they expected from this unction.

Now of these we have two ancient forms remaining, a shorter and a longer; the one an express, and the other an implicit prayer. The shorter form was conceived in these words, Σφράγις δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, *The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit!* as we find it in the first general Council of Constantinople[11], where they order such as were baptized by heretics, to be confirmed by the unction of chrism in this form of words. And so again in the Council of Trullo[12], and in some private writers[13]. Not to mention now, that this is the form still in

342. [al. 346. al. 344.] De chrismate (p. 596 c. 12.) Christi nomen a chrismate est, id est, ab unctione. Quia ideo omnis Christianus sanctificatur, ut intelligat, se non solum sacerdotalis et regiæ dignitatis esse consortem, sed etiam contra Diabolum fieri luctatorem.—Ambros. de Initiatis, [al. De Mysteriis,] c. 6. (t. 2. p. 332 d.) Quantæ hodie renovatæ animæ dilexerunt te, Domine Jesu, dicentes, *Attrahe nos post te; in odorem unguentorum* [al. vestimentorum] *tuorum currimus!* ut odorem resurrectionis haurirent. Quare hoc fiat, intellige, quia *oculi sapientis in capite ejus.* Ideo in barbam defluit, id est, in gratiam juventutis. Ideo in barbam Aaron, ut fias electum genus, sacerdotale, pretiosum. Omnes enim in regnum Dei et in sacerdotium ungimur gratia spiritali.—August. Serm. 3. post 40. a Sirmond. edit. in append. t. 10. p. 847. (Ed. Bened. t. 6. append. p. 291 c. *Sermo de unctione capitis, &c.*) ... Impleto enim baptismate, caput vestrum chrismate, id est, oleo sanctificationis, infundimus: per quod ostenditur, baptizatus regalem et sacerdotalem conferri a Domino dignitatem, &c. Ed.]

[10] L. 3. c. 17. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 288.) Τὸ μύρον, βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας.—L. 7. c. 22. [Labb. c. 23.] (ibid. p. 368.).... Τὸ δὲ μύρον σφραγὶς τῶν συνθηκῶν.

[11] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 b.) Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

[12] C. 95. (t. 6. p. 1182 c.) Τοὺς προστιθεμένους τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ καὶ τῇ μερίδι τῶν σωζομένων ἀπὸ αἱρετικῶν δεχόμεθα,..... καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν, Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

[13] Asterius Amasenus, de Fil. Prod. ap. Phot. Biblioth. cod. 271. (p. 1500. 25.) Ὡς γὰρ ἐν τῇ διὰ τοῦ βαπ-

use in the Euchologium of the present Greek Church. But beside this shorter form, which was only an implicit prayer, as if they had said, Let this unction be unto thee the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit, they had also some larger forms, which were more express prayers; one of which is in the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[14], under the title of *Ἀν εὐχαριστία περὶ τοῦ μυστικοῦ μύρου*, *A thanksgiving* or *benediction to be used in the unction of the mystical chrism*, where the bishop is ordered to anoint the party baptized, saying these words: 'O Lord God, the Unbegotten, who hast no Lord, who art Lord of all, who madest the sweet savour of the knowledge of the Gospel to go forth among all nations, grant now, that this chrism may be effectual in this baptized person, that the sweet savour of thy Christ may remain firm and stable in him, and that he being dead with him, may rise again and live with him.' Now this unction, in the Greek Church, was not only in the forehead, but in several other parts of the body, all performed by the bishop in one and the same act; but the Latins divided the office in some places between the bishop and presbyters, as has been observed before. But whether united or divided, it was all reckoned the unction of confirmation: which is evident from that canon of the Council of Barcelona, which, speaking of presbyters' receiving the consecrated chrism from their bishops, which they themselves were to use, says[15] expressly, 'that it was for confirming neophytes,' or persons newly baptized. Which is a manifest proof, that that part of the ceremony of unction which was committed to presbyters was reckoned a part of confirmation: and so much of it might be committed to presbyters, acting in subordination to their bishop, as the rules of every Church allowed. For this part of confirmation being wholly of ecclesiastical institution, it was in the power of the Church to make orders in all things concern-

τίσματος παλιγγενεσίᾳ καὶ στολὴ καὶ σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου· οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ διὰ τῆς μετανοίας ἀναγεννήσει.

[14] L. 7. c. 44. [Labb. c. 45.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.) *Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀγένητος καὶ ἀδέσποτος, ὁ τῶν ὅλων Κύριος, ὁ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὔοσμον παρασχόμενος· σὺ καὶ νῦν τοῦτο τὸ μύρον δὸς ἐνεργὲς γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ βαπτιζομένῳ, ὥστε βεβαίαν καὶ πάγιον ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν εὐωδίαν μεῖναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ συναποθανόντα αὐτὸν συναναστῆναι καὶ συζῆσαι αὐτῷ.*

[15] C. 2. (t. 5. p. 1605 d.) Statutum conditione est, ut, cum chrisma presbyteris diœcesanis pro neophytis confirmandis datur, nihil pro liquoris pretio accipiatur, &c.

ing it, both in what manner and by what persons she would have it performed. Which is the true reason of so much variety, as we have observed, in different Churches, in the administering this first ceremony of confirmation.

The second ceremony of confirmation was the sign of the cross.

4. Together with this unction they usually joined the sign of the cross. For this ceremony they used upon all occasions, and therefore would not omit it in this solemn act of confirmation. Of this we have several clear proofs in Tertullian, Pope Leo, and others: because however they have been already recited at large[16], in speaking of the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, I will not here repeat them; but only add, that the name, *consignation*, which is so often used by the Latin writers[17] to denote confirmation, seems to have had its rise from this ceremony and custom of *signing with the sign of the cross*, when they gave the unction to persons baptized. And this in some measure answers to the Greek name, σφραγὶς, which many times, though not always, denotes *the sign of the cross*, as used in baptism or confirmation, or any other office of religion; of which I need not here be more particular.

The third and most noted ceremony, imposition of hands; and, fourthly, prayer joined therewith.

5. The most noted ceremony in this whole affair, and that which most universally prevailed, was imposition of hands; a ceremony used in all sorts of benedictions, but more peculiarly applied to ordination, reconciling of penitents, and confirmation. The Latin writers commonly speak of confirmation under this title. But some think it was not in use among the Greeks, who, they say, only used chrism, and not imposition of hands in confirmation. But this is a great mistake: for the author of the Constitutions[18], in the same chapter where he rehearses the prayer of the mystical chrism, immediately subjoins, 'This is the power of imposition of hands necessary for every one: for unless he that is baptized have this invocation of the holy priest, he only goes into the water as a Jew, and

[16] B. 11. ch. 9. s. 6. p. 165, of this volume.

[17] Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1246 b.) De consignandis vero infantibus, manifestum est, non ab alio quam ab episcopo fieri licere.—Conf. Martin. Bracarens. Collect. Can. c. 52. See before, ch. 2. s. 4. p. 217. n. 86.

[18] L. 7. c. 44. [Labb. c. 45.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.) . . . . 'Εκάστου γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τῆς χειροθεσίας ἐστὶν αὕτη, εὰν γὰρ μὴ εἰς ἕκαστον τούτων ἡ ἐπίκλησις γένηται παρὰ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἱερέως τοιαύτη τίς, εἰς ὕδωρ μόνον καταβαίνει ὁ βαπτιζόμενος, ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἀποτίθεται μόνον τὸν ῥύπον τοῦ σώματος, οὐ τὸν ῥύπον τῆς ψυχῆς.

puts off the filth of the body, but not the filth of the soul.' Therefore though this imposition of hands be not so frequently mentioned in the Greek writers, yet it is always to be understood as chrism is in the Latin writers, where only imposition of hands is mentioned.

The original of this ceremony of imposition of hands.

6. The antiquity of this ceremony is by all ancient writers carried as high as the Apostles, and founded upon their example and practice. There are three passages in Scripture from which they generally deduce it: Acts 8, 17, where mention is made of the Apostles laying hands on those whom Philip had baptized: Acts 19, 6, where St. Paul laid his hands on those whom he baptized after John's baptism: and Hebr. 6, 2, where mention is made of imposition of hands among the first principles of religion. Cyprian[19] derives it from the practice of the Apostles laying their hands on those whom Philip baptized: for, says he, 'the same custom is now observed in the Church, that they who are baptized are presented to the governors of the Church, that by their prayer and imposition of hands they may receive the Holy Ghost.' And in other places[20] he refers it in general to apostolical institution and practice. The anonymous author of the Book concerning Heretical Baptism, at the end of Cyprian[21], deduces it likewise from the same example of the Apostles laying hands on the Samaritans whom Philip

[19] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 202. (p. 308.) Illi enim, qui in Samaria crediderant, fide vera crediderant, et intus in ecclesia . . . . . a Philippo diacono, quem iidem Apostoli miserant, baptizati erant. Et idcirco, quia legitimum et ecclesiasticum baptisma consecuti fuerant, baptizari eos ultra non oportebat; sed tantummodo quod deerat, id a Petro et Ioanne factum est, ut, oratione pro eis habita et manu imposita, invocaretur et infunderetur super eos Spiritus Sanctus. Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur, præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur, et [ut] per nostram orationem ac [et] manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur.

[20] Ep. 72. ad Stephan. p. 196. (p. 305.) De eo maxime tibi scribendum, et cum tua gravitate ac sapientia conferendum fuit, quod magis pertineat, et ad sacerdotalem auctoritatem, et ad ecclesiæ catholicæ unitatem pariter ac dignitatem, de divinæ dispositionis ordinatione venientem, eos, qui sint foris extra ecclesiam tincti, et apud hæreticos et schismaticos profanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad ecclesiam, quæ una est, venerint, baptizari oportere; eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, nisi accipiant ecclesiæ baptismum. Tunc enim demum plene sanctificari, et esse filii Dei possunt, si sacramento utroque nascantur, quum scriptum sit, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.*

[21] De Bapt. Hæreticorum, ap. Cypr. p. 23. in append. See before. ch. 2. s. 3. p. 214. n. 73.

baptized. Firmilian[22] compares the bishop's imposition of hands, to invocate the Holy Spirit, to that of St. Paul upon those whom he baptized at Ephesus. St. Jerom[23] owns the Luciferians' argument to be good, when he derives this custom from the Acts of the Apostles, and the case of the Samaritans receiving the imposition of hands after Philip had baptized them: though he thinks the practice and tradition of the Church sufficient to authorize such a custom in this case, as well as in several other rites belonging to baptism and other things, which had the authority of laws, though they were no where expressly commanded in Scripture; as the triple immersion in baptism, and the tasting of milk and honey in token of a new birth. St. Austin[24] in like manner affirms, that this observation descended to the governors of the Church from the Apostles, who prayed over those on whom they laid their hands, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. And because it might be objected that the apostolical practice was for a quite different end, to confer on men the miraculous gift of the Spirit, impowering them to speak with new tongues; he is very careful once or twice to answer this objection, and show, that notwithstanding any such difference, this practice of imposition of hands in order to obtain the Holy Spirit might be said to descend from the Apostles. 'For,' says he[25], 'by the

[22] Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 221. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 214. n. 72.

[23] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 8.] (t. 2. p. 180 d.) An nescis et jam ecclesiarum hunc esse morem, ut baptizatis postea manus imponantur, et ita invocetur Spiritus Sanctus? Exigis ubi scriptum sit? in Actibus Apostolorum. Etiamsi Scripturæ auctoritas non subesset, totius orbis in hac parte consensus instar præcepti obtineret. Nam et multa alia, quæ per traditionem in ecclesiis observantur, auctoritatem sibi scriptæ legis usurpaverunt; velut in lavacro ter caput mergitare; deinde egressos lactis et mellis prægustare concordiam ad infantiæ significationem.

[24] De Trinit. l. 15 .c. 26. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 216. n. 84.

[25] De Bapt. l. 3. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 116 d, e.) Spiritus autem Sanctus, quod in sola catholica per manus impositionem dari dicitur, nimirum hoc intelligi majores nostri voluerunt, quod Apostolus ait, *Quoniam caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis.* Ipsa enim est caritas, quam non habent qui ab ecclesiæ catholicæ communione præcisi sunt; ac per hoc etiamsi linguis hominum et angelorum loquantur, si sciant omnia sacramenta et omnem scientiam, . . . nihil eis prodest. Non autem habent Dei caritatem, qui ecclesiæ non diligunt unitatem; ac per hoc recte intelligitur dici, non accipi nisi in catholica Spiritus Sanctus. Neque enim temporalibus et sensibilibus miraculis attestantibus per manus impositionem modo datur Spiritus Sanctus; sicut antea dabatur ad commendationem rudis fidei, et ecclesiæ primordia dila-

Holy Ghost, which is given only in the Catholic Church by imposition of hands, our forefathers would have us to understand that which the Apostle says, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us." [Rom. 5, 5.] For that is the charity, which they have not who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church; and though they speak with the tongues of men and angels, and know all mysteries and all knowledge, it profits them nothing. For they have not the love of God who love not the unity of the Church; upon which account it is rightly said that the Holy Spirit is not received but only in the Catholic Church. For now the Holy Spirit, which is given by imposition of hands, does not appear with sensible and temporal miracles to attest it, as it was heretofore given to recommend the first plantation of faith, and to dilate the Church in its infancy. For who now expects that they, to whom imposition of hands is given to receive the Holy Spirit, should immediately begin to speak with new tongues? But the love of God is supposed to be inspired into their hearts invisibly and latently by the bond of peace, so as they may truly say, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost that is given us."'

He gives the same answer to this pretended difficulty in another place. 'Hereby,' says he[26], 'we know that he dwells in

tanda. Quis enim nunc hoc expectat, ut ii, quibus manus ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum imponitur, repente incipiant linguis loqui? Sed invisibiliter et latenter intelligitur per [al. propter] vinculum pacis eorum cordibus divina caritas inspirari, ut possint dicere, *Quoniam caritas, &c.*

[26] In 1 Ioan. 3. tract. 6. t. 9. p. 254. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 868 b, c.) *In hoc cognoscimus quia manet in nobis de Spiritu, quem dedit nobis.* Si enim inveneris te habere caritatem, habes Spiritum Dei ad intelligendum. Valde enim necessaria res est. Primis temporibus cadebat super credentes Spiritus Sanctus, et loquebantur linguis, quas non didicerant, quomodo Spiritus dabat eis pronuntiare. Signa erant tempori opportuna. Oportebat enim ita significari in omnibus linguis Spiritum Sanctum: quia evangelium Dei per omnes linguas cursurum erat toto orbe terrarum. Significatum est illud, et transiit. Numquid modo quibus imponitur manus ad accipiendum [al. ut accipiant] Spiritum Sanctum, hoc exspectatur, ut linguis loquantur? Aut quando imposuimus manum istis infantibus, attendit unusquisque vestrum, utrum linguis loquerentur? Et cum videret eos linguis non loqui, ita perverso corde aliquis vestrum fuit, ut diceret, Non acceperunt isti Spiritum Sanctum; nam si accepissent, linguis loquerentur, quemadmodum tunc factum est? Si ergo per hæc miracula non fiat modo testimonium præsentiæ Spiritus Sancti; unde fit, unde cognoscit

us, by the Spirit which he hath given us. If thou findest in thy heart the love of God, thou hast the Spirit to give thee knowledge. Which is a very necessary thing. In the first age the Holy Ghost fell on them that believed, and they spake with tongues, which they had never learned, as the Spirit gave them utterance. These were signs proper for that time; for then it was necessary that the Holy Ghost should be thus demonstrated in all kinds of tongues; because the Gospel was to run throughout the whole world in all sorts of languages. But this demonstration once made, it ceased; for does any man now expect to hear them speak with new tongues, who receive imposition of hands as a means to obtain the Holy Spirit? Or, when we laid hands on these infants, did any of you look when they should speak with tongues? And when they did not speak with tongues, was any one so perverse in heart as to say, they had not received the Holy Ghost; for if they had received it, they would have spoken with tongues, as was done heretofore? If, therefore, there be no such miracles now to testify the presence of the Spirit, how knows any man that he has received the Holy Ghost? Let him ask his own heart: if he loves the brethren, the Spirit of God abideth in him.' Thus St. Austin derives imposition of hands for conveying the Spirit from the practice of the Apostles, though there were very different effects then from what there are now. Though men had not the gift of tongues conferred upon them as in the days of the Apostles, yet they might have other graces, sufficient both to testify the presence of the Spirit, and to entitle the act of imposition of hands to the dignity of an apostolical institution. From whence also we may observe, that charity and unity, or steadfastness in the love of God and religion, was a particular grace of the Spirit given by imposition of hands: which because heretics could not have, who were baptized out of the Church, therefore they always received imposition of hands upon their return to the Church[27], whether they had received it in pretence among their own party before or not.

quisque accepisse se Spiritum Sanctum? Interroget cor suum: si diligit fratrem, manet Spiritus Dei in illo.

[27] De Bapt. l. 5. c. 23. (t. 9. p. 157 d.) Propter caritatis autem copulationem, quod est maximum donum Spiritus Sancti, sine quo non valent quæcunque alia sancta in homine fuerint, manus hæreticis correctis imponitur.

For some heretics gave imposition of hands together with baptism, and others did not: but both of them received imposition of hands again upon their return to the Catholic Church.

There is one passage more, upon which some of the Ancients found this practice, which is Hebr. 6, 2, where the Apostle joins imposition of hands with baptism. Upon which the author under the name of St. Ambrose[28] notes, 'that it means that imposition of hands, which is supposed to confer the Holy Ghost, which is ordinarily given by the chief priests or bishops after baptism, for the confirmation of men in the unity of the Church of Christ.' Which exposition is repeated by Haimo[29], and some later writers, and allowed as probable by Grotius and Calvin.

There is one writer more, who seems to derive it from the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles at the day of Pentecost. He goes under the name of Eusebius Emissenus; but learned men suppose him to be Eucherius of Lyons, or Hilary of Arles, or some other writer about the time of Pope Leo, in the middle of the fifth century. Whoever he was, the account he gives of confirmation is very particular and instructive, and therefore the whole passage may be worth translating. 'That which imposition of hands,' says he[30], 'now gives to

[28] In Hebr. 6, 2. (ap. Ed. Paris. 1661. t. 3. p. 633. Deest in Ed. Bened.) *Impositionis manuum:* per quam Spiritus Sanctus accipi posse creditur: quod post baptismum ad confirmationem unitatis in ecclesia Christi a pontificibus fieri solet.

[29] In Hebr. 6, 2. ap. Dall. de Confirmat. l. 3. c. 13. See before, ch. 1. s. 4. p. 206. second part of n. 41.

[30] Hom. de Pentecost. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 6. p. 649 c.) . . . Quod nunc in confirmandis neophytis manus impositio tribuit singulis, hoc tunc Spiritus Sancti descensio in credentium populo donavit universis. Sed quia diximus, quod manus impositio et confirmatio ei, qui jam renatus in Christo est, conferre aliquid possit, forte cogitat sibi aliquis, Quid mihi prodest, post mysterium baptismatis, ministerium confirmantis? Aut, Quantum video, non totum de fonte suscepimus, si post fontem adjectione novi generis indigemus. Non ita est, dilectissimi, attendat caritas vestra. Sic enim exigit militaris ordo, ut cum imperator quemcunque in militum receperit numerum, non solum signet receptum, sed etiam armis competentibus instruat pugnaturum: ita in baptizato benedictio illa munitio est; dedisti militem, da ei adjumenta militiæ. Numquid prodest, si quisquam parentum magnam parvulo conferat facultatem, nisi providere studeat et tutorem? Ita Paracletus regeneratis in Christo custos, et consolator, et tutor est. Ideo dicit sermo divinus: *Nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem, in vanum vigilant, qui custodiunt eam.* Ergo Spiritus Sanctus, qui super aquas baptismi salutifero descendit illapsu, in fonte plenitudinem tribuit ad innocentiam, in confirmatione augmentum præstat ad gratiam. Quia in hoc mundo tota ætate victuris inter invisibiles hostes

every one in confirming neophytes, the same did the descent of the Holy Ghost then confer on all believers. But because we have said that imposition of hands and confirmation confers something on him that is born again and regenerated in Christ, perhaps some one will be ready to think with himself, and say, what can the ministry of confirmation profit me after the mystery of baptism? If, after the font, we want the addition of a new office, then we have not received all that was necessary from the font. It is not so, beloved. For, if you observe, in the military life, when the emperor has chosen any one to be a soldier, he does not only set his mark or character upon him, but furnishes him with competent arms for fighting; so it is in a baptized person, the benediction is his armour. Thou hast made him a soldier; give him also the weapons of warfare. What doth it profit, though a father confer a great estate upon his child, if he do not also provide him a tutor? Now the Holy Ghost is the keeper, and comforter, and tutor to those who are regenerated in Christ. As the Scripture saith, "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." Therefore the Holy Ghost, which descends with his saving presence on the waters of baptism, there gives us the plenitude of perfection to make us innocent; but in confirmation, He gives us an augmentation of grace. Because in this world we are to live all our lives among invisible enemies, and to walk in the midst of dangers; in baptism, we are born again to life, but after baptism, we are confirmed to fight; in baptism, we are

et pericula gradiendum est: in baptismo regeneramur ad vitam; post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam: in baptismo abluimur; post baptismum roboramur. Ac sic continuo transituris sufficiunt regenerationis beneficia; victuris autem necessaria sunt confirmationis auxilia. Regeneratio per se salvat mox in pace beati sæculi recipiendos; confirmatio armat et instruit ad agones mundi hujus et prælia reservandos. Qui autem post baptismum cum acquisita innocentia immaculatus pervenit ad mortem, confirmatur morte: quia jam non potest peccare post mortem. Huic si forte illud etiam requirere velimus, post passionem et resurrectionem Christi, quid Apostolis profuerit adventus Spiritus Sancti? ipse Dominus eis hoc evidenter exponit: *Quæ dico,* inquit, *vobis, non potestis ea portare modo. Cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, ipse vos docebit omnem veritatem.* Vides, quia cum Spiritus Sanctus infunditur, cor fidele ad prudentiam et constantiam dilatatur. Itaque ad descensionem Spiritus Sancti usque ad negationem Apostoli deterrentur; post visitationem vero ejus, usque ad martyrium contemptu salutis armantur. Secundum hæc per Christum redimimur; per Spiritum vero Sanctum dono sapientiæ spiritualis illuminamur, ædificamur, erudimur, instruimur, consummamur.

washed, but after baptism we are strengthened, and so the benefits of regeneration are sufficient for those who presently leave this world; but to them, who are to live in it, the auxiliary aids of the confirmation are also necessary. Regeneration by itself alone saves those who are presently received in peace into a better world; but confirmation arms and prepares those who are reserved to fight the battles and combats of this world. He that after baptism goes immaculate with the innocence which he has acquired to death, is confirmed by death; because he cannot sin after death. If here we shall ask, what advantage the Apostles had by the coming of the Holy Spirit after the passion and resurrection of Christ? the Lord himself evidently shows us, saying, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." [John 16, 12 and 13.] You see, when the Holy Ghost is given, the heart of a believer is dilated and enlarged with prudence and constancy. Before the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles were terrified even to the denial of Christ; but after his visitation, they were armed with a contempt of death, even to suffer martyrdom for his sake. Thus it is that we have redemption by Christ, but the Holy Ghost gives us the gift of spiritual wisdom, by which we are illuminated, edified, instructed, and consummated to perfection.'

This is the account which the Ancients generally give of the original of imposition of hands: which ceremony is now wholly laid aside and disused in the Roman Church, though they pretend to make another sacrament of confirmation. But this only by the way.

What opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of confirmation.

7. From the account given by this author we clearly learn what the Ancients supposed confirmation superadded to the benefit of regeneration. The new birth gave innocence and pardon of sins; but the invocation of the Spirit added wisdom and strength to preserve and establish men in innocence to perfection. He also shows us what opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of confirmation. It was not absolutely the same as that of baptism. For if men died immediately after baptism, without imposition of hands, they were saved by their innocence which they had acquired in baptism: they needed no other confirmation but death, which was a security against

all other dangers. Confirmation was only necessary to those who were to live and fight with the world and invisible powers. And this is the sense of all other writers, who speak the highest of the necessity of the confirmation.

The Council of Eliberis[31] having said, 'that it was necessary for the bishop to consummate those by his benediction who were baptized by deacons,' adds, 'yet if any one die before this can be done, he is justified by the faith which he professed in baptism.' And so the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[32] says, 'If there be neither oil nor chrism, the water alone is sufficient both for the unction of the Holy Ghost, and the seal of the covenant.' By which we are to mollify that other harsh expression of his in another place[33], where he says 'that baptism without this imposition of hands, and prayer of the priest, is only a bodily washing, like that of the Jews, purging the filth of the body, but not of the soul.' For unless some very candid interpretation be put upon this expression, it will be highly injurious and derogatory to the saving power of baptism, which purges away sin by a spiritual regeneration. And therefore it is but reasonable to let the harsh expressions of this author be interpreted by himself, when he owns that the water of baptism is sufficient to answer all the ends of chrism or confirmation, where that is omitted not by any contempt, but for want of opportunity to receive it. And this is plainly St. Jerom's meaning, when[34] he says, 'that though the practice of imposition of hands descends from the Acts of the Apostles; yet in many places it was observed rather for the honour of the chief priesthood than for any absolute necessity of the thing. For otherwise, if the Spirit was only obtained by

[31] C. 77. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 215. n. 76.

[32] L. 7. c. 22. [Labb. c. 23.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 368.) Εἰ δὲ μήτε ἔλαιον ᾖ, μήτε μύρον, ἀρκεῖ ὕδωρ, καὶ πρὸς χρίσιν καὶ πρὸς σφραγῖδα.

[33] L. 7. c. 44. See before, s. 5. n. 18, preceding.

[34] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 9.] (t. 2. p. 181 c.) Quod si obloqueris, [al. hoc loco queris] quare in ecclesia baptizatus, nisi per manus episcopi non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos asserimus in vero baptismate tribui? disce hanc observationem ex ea auctoritate descendere, quod post ascensum Domini Spiritus Sanctus ad Apostolos descendit. Multis in locis id tamen esse factum reperimus ad honorem potius sacerdotii, quam ad legem necessitatis. Alioquin si episcopi tantum imprecatione Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lugendi sunt qui, in villulis aut in castellis aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt, quam ab episcopis inviserentur.

the prayer of the bishop, those men must be in a deplorable condition that were baptized in villages and castles and remote places by presbyters and deacons, and died before the bishop could come to visit them.' All therefore that was necessary to salvation was conferred in baptism, which ministered such a portion of the Spirit as was sufficient to cleanse men from sin, and qualify them for eternal life.

So that when some of the Ancients say, 'that baptism does not minister the Spirit, which was only given by imposition of hands in confirmation,' as Cornelius pleads in his letter against Novatian[34], and Tertullian[35], who says, 'that we do not obtain the Holy Ghost in baptism, but are only cleansed in the water, and prepared for the Holy Ghost;' they are to be understood as meaning only that the Holy Ghost is not given in that full measure at baptism, as afterward by imposition of hands. They do not deny, that baptism grants men remission of sins by the power of the Holy Ghost; but only, that there are some further effects and operations of the Holy Spirit, which are not ordinarily conferred on men but by the subsequent invocation of the Spirit, the increase of which men were to desire, and to receive imposition of hands in order to obtain it. In which sense it is said in the Gospel, 'that the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because the Apostles had not yet received that plentiful effusion of it in the gift of tongues, which they afterwards had on the day of Pentecost,' though they had before received such a measure of it, as both enabled them to work several sorts of miracles, and also qualified them in every respect for the kingdom of Heaven.

How they punished those that neglected it.

8. But though the Ancients did not think this imposition of hands so absolutely necessary, as that the want of it should exclude those, who were baptized, from the kingdom of heaven: yet they thought fit to punish the neglect of it, by setting some marks of disgrace and public censure upon such, as voluntarily and carelessly omitted it, when they had opportunity to receive it. Such men were ordinarily denied the privilege of ecclesiastical promotion and holy orders. As

[34] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 313. 22.) Τούτου μὴ τυχὼν, πῶς ἂν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἔτυχε.

[35] De Bapt. c. 6. (p. 226.) Non quod aquis [al. in aqua] Spiritum Sanctum consequamur, sed in aqua emendati [al. emundati] sub angelo Spiritui Sancto præparamur.

appears from the objection made against Novatian[36], 'that he ought not to be ordained, because being baptized privately with clinic baptism, he had afterwards neglected to receive his consummation from the hands of the bishop, which he ought to have done by the laws of the Church,' and to this purpose the Council of Neo-Cæsarea[37] has a canon, forbidding such to be ordained; which is made part of the Code of the Universal Church. The Council of Eliberis[38] also excludes such as have not *lavacrum integrum, their own baptism completed by imposition of hands,* from the privilege of giving baptism to others, which in cases of necessity they allowed to all other laymen.

So far they thought fit to discountenance the contempt and neglect of confirmation, though they neither esteemed it a distinct sacrament from baptism, nor of absolute necessity to salvation, but only as a proper means to strengthen men in their Christian warfare.

CHAP. IV.

Of the remaining ceremonies of baptism following confirmation.

Persons newly baptized, clothed in white garments.

1. Much about the same time as the unction of confirmation was administered to persons newly baptized, they were also clothed in white garments. In the Latin Church it came immediately before confirmation; but in the Greek Church it seems to have followed after. For Cyril of Jerusalem[39] speaks of it as following the unction. This was to represent their having "put off the old man with his deeds, and having put

[36] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 313. 15.) Ὃς βοηθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπορκιστῶν, νόσῳ περιπεσὼν χαλεπῇ, καὶ ἀποθανεῖσθαι ὅσον οὐδέπω νομιζόμενος, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ, ᾗ ἔκειτο, περιχυθεὶς ἔλαβεν· εἴγε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι; οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτυχε, διαφυγὼν τὴν νόσον, ὧν χρὴ μεταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, τοῦ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου· τούτου δὲ μὴ τυχὼν, πῶς ἂν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἔτυχε; . . . . . Ὃς διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, κ. τ. λ.

[37] C. 12. (t. 1. p. 1484 b.) Ἐὰν νοσῶν τις φωτισθῇ, εἰς πρεσβύτερον ἄγεσθαι οὐ δύναται· οὐκ ἐκ προαιρέσεως γὰρ ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης· εἰ μὴ τάχα διὰ τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ σπουδὴν καὶ πίστιν, καὶ διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων.

[38] C. 38. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 215. n. 75.

[39] Catech. [22.] Mystag. 4. n. 2. [al. n. 8.] (p. 322 b.) . . . . Καὶ ἐνδυσάμενον τὰ πνευματικὰ λευκὰ χρὴ λευχειμονεῖν διαπαντὸς, κ. τ. λ.

on the new man." [Col. 3, 9 and 10.] Hence they were called λευχειμονοῦντες, and *grex Christi candidus et niveus, the white flock of Christ,* as we find in Lactantius[39] and many others[40]. Palladius, in the Life of St. Chrysostom[41], notes it particularly, as a great piece of barbarity in Arcadius, that, when St. Chrysostom's presbyters in his exile had baptized three thousand persons at one festival, the Emperor sent his soldiers to disperse them, as they were λευχειμονοῦντες, *clothed in their white garments.* This was otherwise called, *the garment of Christ,* and *the mystical garment.* For so Socrates[42] and Sozomen[43], speaking of the ordination of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, which was immediately given him after his baptism, say, 'He was ordained whilst he had his mystical garment on,' meaning this white robe, which had just before been given him at his baptism. St. Jerom also, writing to Fabiola[44], seems to allude to this, when he says, 'We are to be washed with the precepts of God, and when we are prepared for the garment of Christ, putting off our coats of skins, we shall put on the linen garment, that hath nothing

[39] Carm. de Resurrect. Dom. [ap. Ed. Oxon. 8vo. deest. Vid. ap. Ed. Le Brun. (p. 272.) t. 2. Venant. Honor. Clement. Fortunat. ad Felic. Episc. de Pascha.]

Fulgentes animas vestis quoque candida signat,
Et grege de niveo gaudia pastor habet.

[40] Moschus, Prat. Spirit. c. 207. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1158 d. 6.) ... Ἰδόντες αὐτὴν λευκοφοροῦσαν, κ. τ. λ.—Paulinus, Ep. 12. ad Sever. (p. 145.)

Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos
Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.

[See Suicer. Thes. Eccles. vocibus, Λευχείμων et Λευχειμονέω, (t. 2. p. 228.) where the examples do not refer to the white dresses of the baptized; for which, I apprehend, the terms, λαμπροφόρος and λαμπροφορέω, were more frequently employed. See Suicer. ibid. (p. 213.) and compare the passage cited before (b. 1. ch. 3. s. 1. p. 31. n. 55.) from Photii Bibliotheca, cod. 222., Οἱ φωτιζόμενοι ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας λαμπροφοροῦσιν. Ed.]

[41] C. 9. (t. 13. p. 34 e.) Τῇ ἐπαύριον γοῦν ἐξελθὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς, τοῦ γυμνασθῆναι ἐν τῷ παρακειμένῳ πεδίῳ, εἶδεν τὴν ἄσπορον γῆν, τὴν περὶ τὸ Πέμπτον, λευχειμονοῦσαν· καὶ ἐκπλαγεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ τοῦ ἄνθους τῶν νεοφωτίστων· ἦσαν γὰρ ἀμφὶ τοὺς τρισχιλίους· ἤρετο παρὰ τῶν δορυφόρων, Τίς ἡ λογὰς τῶν ἐκεῖ συνθροισμένων;

[42] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 269. 36.) ... Ὃς, ἁρπασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προεβλήθη, τῶν τότε παρόντων ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἐπισκόπων χειροτονησάντων αὐτόν.

[43] L. 7. c. 8. (ibid. p. 288. 5.) ... Καὶ, τὴν μυστικὴν ἐσθῆτα ἔτι ἠμφιεσμένος, κοινῇ ψήφῳ τῆς συνόδου ἀναγορεύεται Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος.

[44] Ep. 128. [al. 64.] (t. 1. p. 367 b.) Præceptis Dei lavandi sumus, et cum, parati ad indumentum Christi, tunicas pelliceas deposuerimus, tunc induemur veste linea, nihil in sese mortis habente, sed tota candida, ut, de baptismo consurgentes, cingamus lumbos in veritate, &c.

of death in it, but is all white, that rising out of the waters of baptism, we may gird about our loins with truth, and cover the former filthiness of our breasts.' Some also allege two other passages in his Epistles to Pope Damasus[45], where he speaks of 'his having put on the garment of Christ at Rome.' But others[46] who have more exactly considered the time of St. Jerom's baptism, and the same phrase as used by him in other places, more probably conclude, that he means the monastic habit, which he elsewhere[47] calls 'the garment of Christ,' and not the *albes* of baptism. However not insisting on those dubious passages of St. Jerom, the ancient custom is sufficiently attested from other authors.

These sometimes delivered to them with a solemn form of words.

2. Some of which also tell us, that these garments were wont to be delivered to the neophytes with a solemn form of words, in the nature of a charge: such as that in Gregory's Sacramentarium[48], 'Receive the white and immaculate garment, which thou mayest bring forth without spot before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen.'

Worn eight days, and then laid

3. These garments were commonly worn eight days, and then laid up in the church. St. Austin[49], or some one under

[45] Ep. 57. [al. 15.] (t. 1. p. 37 b.) Cathedram Petri, et fidem apostolico ore laudatam censui consulendam; inde nunc meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi.—Item, Ep. 58. [al. 16.] ad Eund. (ibid. p. 41 c.) Christi vestem in Romana urbe suspiciens, nunc barbaro Syriæ limite teneor.

[46] See Wall's History of Infant Baptism, part. 2. ch. 3. s. 10.

[47] Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. (ibid. p. 87 c.) Non expedit, apprehenso aratro, . . . post Christi tunicam, ad tollendum aliud vestimentum tecto descendere.

[48] De Bapt. Infant. (ap. Pamelii Liturgica, Colon. 1571. t. 2. p. 269.) Vestitur infans, dicente presbytero; *Accipe vestem candidam et immaculatam, quam perferas sine macula ante tribunal Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut habeas vitam æternam. Amen.* [See before, b. 11. ch. 11. s. 2. p. 180. n. 49. and my remarks thereon.—Compare also Menard's 327th note on Gregory's Sacramentary, (t. 3. p. 356 a. 1.) *Albis* videlicet: nam educti e fonte baptismali induebantur albis vestimentis in signum candoris et puritatis mentis, &c.—See also the Gallican Sacramentary in Mabillon's Musæum Italicum, Paris. 1687. 4to. (p. 325.) in the *Ordo Baptismi*, q. v. Ed.] Conf. Ord. Rom. de S. Sabbato, ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 10. p. 83. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 13. p. 697 b. 1.) Deportantur ipsi infantes ante eum, et dat singulis stolam candidam et decem siliquas et chrismale, [al. chrisma et decem siliquas,] dicens, *Accipe vestem candidam, &c.*

[49] Hom. 86. de Divers. in Octav. Pasch. t. 10. p. 709. Paschalis solennitas hodierna festivitate concluditur, et ideo hodie neophytorum habitus commutatur; ita tamen, ut candor, qui de habitu deponitur, semper in corde teneatur. [The Homily or Sermon, as cited by the Author, corresponds with Serm. 233. of the Benedictine Edition, (t. 5. p. 984 e.) but the passage given is

his name, speaks of the Sunday after Easter, as the time appointed for this purpose. That was the conclusion of the Paschal Festival, and then the neophytes changed their habit; whence that day is thought to have the name of *Dominica in Albis;* and *White Sunday*, [commonly termed *Whit-Sunday*,] is said to be so called from this custom of wearing white robes after baptism. These being laid aside, were carefully preserved in the vestries of the church, as an evidence against men, if afterward they violated those professions which they had made in baptism. up in the church.

A remarkable instance of which we have, related in Victor Uticensis[50], concerning one Elpidiphorus, a citizen of Carthage, who having a long time lived in the communion of the Church at last turned Arian, and became a bitter enemy to the Orthodox in the Vandalic persecution. Among others, whom he summoned before him as their judge, was one Muritta, a deacon, who had been sponsor for him at his baptism. He being ready to be put upon the rack, produced against him those white robes, with which he had been clothed at his baptism; and with words melting all the whole city into tears, he thus bespoke him: 'These are the garments, O Elpidiphorus, thou minister of error, which shall accuse thee, when the majesty of the great judge shall appear; these I will diligently keep as a testimony of thy ruin, which shall depress thee to the bottom of the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. These are

not to be found there. It occurs in Serm. 157. de Tempore of the *Ordo Vetus*, which agrees with Serm. 172. of the appendix according to the *Ordo Novus* of the Benedictine. (t. 5. append. p. 296.) Ed.]

[50] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 3. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 7. p. 613. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. [c. 5.] p. 694 g. 6.) Hæc sunt linteamina, Elpidiphore, minister erroris, quæ te accusabunt, dum majestas venerit judicantis. Custodientur diligentia mea ad testimonium perditionis, ad demergendum te in abysso putei sulphurantis. Hæc te, infelix, immaculatum cinxerunt de fonte surgentem: hæc te, miserrime, acrius persequentur, flammantem gehennam dum cœperis possidere, quia induisti maledictionem sicut vestimentum, scindens atque amittens veri baptismatis et fidei sacramentum. Quid facturus es, miser, quum servi patrisfamilias ad cœnam regiam congregare cœperint invitatos? Tunc te aliquando vocatum, terribiliter indignatus, exutum stola rex conspiciet nuptiali, dicetque tibi: Amice, quo modo huc venisti, vestem non habens nuptialem? Non video, quod contuli, non nosco, quod dedi. Perdidisti militiæ chlamydem, quam in tela virgineorum membrorum decem mensibus texui, et tendicula crucis extendens aqua mundavi, et purpura mei sanguinis decoravi: non conspicio cultum signaculi mei: characterem non video Trinitatis, &c.

they, that were girt about thee, when thou camest immaculate out of the holy font; these are they that shall bitterly pursue thee, when thou shalt begin to take thy portion in the flames of hell; because thou hast clothed thyself with cursing as with a garment, and hast cast off the sacred obligation of thy baptism, and the true faith which thou didst then profess and take upon thee.' So that the design of this significant ceremony was first to represent that innocence and angelical purity, which every man obtained by the remission of his sins in baptism, and then to remind them of the obligations and professions they had entered into, which if they violated, would rise up as so many accusers at the Day of Judgment.

The ceremony of lights and tapers. What intended by it. And at whose charge both these were provided.

4. To this ceremony of wearing white robes, they added another of the like nature, which was the carrying of lighted tapers in their hands. I cannot say this was so universal a practice as the former, but it is mentioned by Gregory Nazianzen[51] among other ceremonies following baptism. 'The station,' says he, 'when immediately after baptism thou shalt be placed before the altar, is an emblem of the glory of the life to come; the psalmody with which thou shalt be received, is a foretaste of those hymns and songs of a better life; and the lamps, which thou shalt light, are a figure of those lamps of faith, wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet the bridegroom.' Others refer it to another reason, that it might be a symbol of their own present illumination, and as done in allusion to that saying of our Saviour. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." (Matth. 5, 16.) In some baptisms also of great men, we find these ceremonies enlarged and set off with greater pomp; for not only they themselves, but all their retinue and attendance were clothed in white garments, and all carried lamps in their hands. As it was in the magnificent baptism of the younger Theodosius,

[51] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 672 a.) 'Η στάσις, ἣν αὐτίκα στήσῃ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου βήματος, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν δόξης ἐστι προχάραγμα· ἡ ψαλμῳδία, μεθ' ἧς δεχθήσῃ, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ὑμνῳδίας προοίμιον· αἱ λαμπάδες, ἅσπερ ἀνάψεις, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν φωταγωγίας μυστήριον, μεθ' ἧς ἀπαντήσομεν τῷ νυμφίῳ, φαιδραὶ καὶ παρθένοι ψυχαὶ φαιδραῖς ταῖς λαμπάσι τῆς πίστεως, μήτε καθεύδουσαι διὰ ῥαθυμίαν, ἵνα μὴ λάθῃ παρὼν ἀδοκήτως ὁ προσδοκώμενος, μήτε ἄτροφοι καὶ ἀνέλαιοι, καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ἐπιδεεῖς, ἵνα μὴ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐκπέσωμεν.

related in an Epistle of Marcus Gazenzis published by Baronius[52], where he says; 'The procession from the church to the palace was extremely splendid: for the leaders of the people were all clothed in white, which made the company look as if it had been covered with snow: and all the senators, and men of quality, and soldiers in their ranks carried lamps in their hands, that one would have thought the stars had appeared upon earth.'

The expense of these things, especially when so very sumptuous and magnificent, we may reasonably suppose, was defrayed by every person at his own proper cost and charge. And so the objection, which some make in Gregory Nazianzen against Baptism[53], upon the account of the charge attending it, plainly intimates. For they thus object against it: 'Where is the gift that I shall offer at baptism? Where is the garment of light in which I must shine? Wherewithal shall I entertain my baptizers?' To which Nazianzen replies, 'That in great things men should not be concerned about such small matters as these. For the sacrament itself was far above these visible objects. Therefore offer thyself for a gift, put on Christ for a garment, and let thy entertainment of me the minister be an holy conversation. God requires no great thing of us, which the poor cannot give.' From whence we may conclude, that either these ceremonies were omitted in the baptism of poor men, or else the Church herself was at the charge of them. Which some think may be inferred from the donations of Constantine made to the baptisteries of Rome, mentioned in the Pontifical in the Life of Pope Sylvester; but it may more certainly be proved from the Epistles of Pope Gregory[54], where he often mentions

[52] An. 401. (t. 5. p. 136 e.) Baptizato Juniori Theodosio, et ab ecclesia egresso in palatium, licebat rursus intueri decorem [al. virtutem] eorum qui præerant multitudini, et vestem eorum refulgentem. Erant enim omnes candidati, ut existimaretur multitudo esse nive repleta. Præcedebant, autem patricii, illustres, et omnis dignitas cum ordinibus militaribus, omnes portantes cereos, ut putarentur astra cerni in terra. [Conf. ap. Galland. (t. 9. p. 268 e.) c. 7. n. 47. Ed.]

[53] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 655 c.) . . . Ποῦ δέ μοι τὸ καρποφορούμενον ἐπὶ τῷ βαπτίσματι; ποῦ δὲ ἐμφώτειος ἐσθὴς, ᾗ λαμπρυνθήσομαι; ποῦ δὲ τὰ πρὸς δεξίωσιν τῶν ἐμῶν βαπτιστῶν; . . . Μὴ μικρολόγει περὶ τὰ μεγάλα, μηδὲν ἀγεννὲς πάθῃς· μεῖζον τῶν ὁρωμένων ἐστὶ τὸ μυστήριον· σαυτὸν καρποφόρησον, Χριστὸν ἔνδυσαι, θρέψον με πολιτείᾳ, οὕτως ἐγὼ χαίρω φιλοφρονούμενος. Οὐδὲν τῷ Θεῷ μέγα, ὃ μὴ καὶ πένης δίδωσιν, ἵνα μὴ κἀνταῦθα παραθῶνται οἱ πένητες.

[54] L. 7. Ep. 24. ad Faustin. (CC.

his giving these garments to the poor, who could not provide them for themselves.

The kiss of peace given to persons newly baptized.

5. Another ceremony used to congratulate such as were newly baptized, upon their admission and incorporation into the Church, was the kiss of peace. Which was observed even towards infants, as we learn from that objection raised against it in Cyprian: where the opponents pleaded for deferring baptism till the child was eight days old, because children at their birth were unclean, and every one abhorred to kiss them, as was necessary to be done after baptism, to testify their right of fraternity upon their adoption into God's family. To which Cyprian[55] replied, 'That this was no impediment to their baptism; for all things were clean to them that were clean. No one ought to abhor that which God had vouchsafed to make. For though an infant was but just born, yet he was then in such a condition, as no one ought to abhor in giving him the grace of baptism, or imparting to him the kiss of peace.' This custom is also mentioned by St. Austin[56], and it seems to be founded upon that Apostolical rule, observed in the eucharist and other holy offices, of saluting one another with an holy kiss, in token of their most cordial affection, and acknowledging one another as brethren. St. Chrysostom[57] gives another reason why it

t. 5. p. 1301 d.) Quoscunque ex iis pauperes, et ad vestem sibi emendam non sufficere posse, cognoscis: te eis vestem, quam ad baptisma habeant, comparare volumus ac præbere.—Vid. l. 4. Ep. 16. (ibid. p. 1172 a.) Vestem vero ei, quæ baptizanda est, direximus, &c.

[55] Ep. 69. [al. 64.] ad Fid. p. 160. (p. 281.) Nam et quod vestigium infantis in primis partus sui diebus constituti mundum non esse dixisti, quod unusquisque nostrum adhuc horreat exosculari; nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento esse oportere: scriptum est enim, Omnia munda sunt mundis. Nec aliquis nostrum id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus est facere. Nam etsi adhuc infans a partu novus est, non ita est tamen, ut quisquam illum in gratia danda atque in pace faciendа exosculari horrere debeat, [al. horrere debeat osculari.] quando in osculo infantis unus quisque nostrum pro sua religione ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat cogitare, quas in homine modo formato et recens nato quodammodo exosculamur, quando id, quod Deus fecit amplectimur.

[56] Cont. Ep. Pelag. l. 4. c. 8. (t. 10. p. 480 d.)

[57] Serm. 1. de Utilit. Scriptur. Legend. t. 5. p. 686. (t. 3. p. 80 e.) Ἀλλ' οὐ τοιοῦτος ὁ πρότερος [τόκος]; ἀλλ' ἀπὸ θρήνων ἔχει τὴν ἀρχήν· τὸ γὰρ παιδίον, ἐκ τῆς μήτρας ὀλισθαῖνον καὶ ἐκ τῆς νηδύος καταφερόμενον, πρώτην φωνὴν μετὰ δακρύων ἐκβάλλει· . . . διὰ θρήνων γὰρ ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὸν βίον, διὰ δακρύων προοίμια, τῆς φύσεως τὸ μέλλον ὀδυνηρὸν προαναφωνούσης. . . . Οὐ δάκρυα δὲ ἐν τῇ γεννήσει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σπάργανα καὶ δεσμά· δάκρυα ἐν τῇ γεννήσει, δάκρυα ἐν θανάτῳ, σπάργανα ἐν γεννήσει, σπάργανα ἐν θανάτῳ· ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι πρὸς θάνατον ἡ ζωὴ αὕτη τελευτᾷ, καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο καταστρέψει τὸ τέλος.

was called *the peace*, or *the kiss of peace*, because men were now reconciled to God by baptism, and restored to His peace and favour. For elegantly comparing the two nativities of man together, the natural and the spiritual, he says, 'The first birth is always attended with tears and lamentations, nature as it were presaging the subsequent sorrows and miseries of life: but in the second birth it is otherwise; here are no tears or mournings, but salutations, and kisses, and embracings of the brethren, who acknowledge the person baptized as one of their own members, and receive him as one returning from a long peregrination out of his own country. For because before his baptism he was an enemy, but after baptism he is made a friend of our common Lord, we therefore all rejoice with him: and upon this account the kiss has the name of peace, that we may learn thereby that God has ended the war, and received us into familiarity and friendship with himself.' Hence it is, that to 'give the peace' to any one, is the same thing many times in the writings of the Ancients, as to 'salute him with the holy kiss,' in the phrase of the Apostle.

And a taste of honey and milk, in token of their new birth.

6. They were used also to give to the newly baptized a little taste of honey and milk: which Salmasius[58] and some others suppose to be given them instead of the eucharist: but that is a mistake, for the eucharist was given them at the same time. The Ancients themselves give another reason for it. St. Jerom[59] and Tertullian[60] say it was to signify their new birth, and that they were now as children adopted into God's family. Tertullian[61] says moreover, that the Marcionites retained the

Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἡ γέννησις αὕτη· οὐδαμοῦ δάκρυα καὶ σπάργανα, ἀλλὰ λελυμένος ὁ γεννηθεὶς, καὶ πρὸς ἀγῶνας παρεσκευασμένος· διὰ τοῦτο ἄφετοι οἱ πόδες καὶ αἱ χεῖρες, ἵνα τρέχῃ καὶ πυκτεύῃ· οὐδαμοῦ θρῆνος, οὐδαμοῦ δάκρυα ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ' ἀσπασμοὶ καὶ φιλίαι, καὶ περιπλοκαὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, τὸ οἰκεῖον μέλος ἐπιγινωσκόντων, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ μακρᾶς ἀπολαβόντων ἀποδημίας. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ φωτίσματος ἐχθρὸς ἦν, μετὰ δὲ τὸ φώτισμα γέγονε φίλος τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Δεσπότου· διὰ τοῦτο πάντες συνηδόμεθα· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ φίλημα εἰρήνη καλεῖται, ἵνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι πόλεμον κατέλυσεν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ πρὸς τὴν οἰκείωσιν ἐπανήγαγε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ.

[58] Ap. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. (t. 2. p. 1136 b.) Adulti in pane et vino sacramentum corporis et sanguinis accipiebant; infantes, in lacte et melle.

[59] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 8.] (t. 2. p. 180 e.)... Deinde egressos lactis et mellis prægustare concordiam ad infantiæ significationem.

[60] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Inde suscepti lactis et mellis prægustamus concordiam.

[61] Cont. Marcion. l. 1. c. 14. (p. 372 b.) Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, qua

custom for the same reason, as they did many other usages of the Church. St. Jerom[62] says further, 'that in some of the Western Churches the mixture was made up of milk and wine instead of honey, and this in allusion to those passages of the Apostle, "I have fed you with milk, and not with strong meat." [1 Cor. 3, 2.] And St. Peter's saying, "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word." [1 Pet. 2, 2.] For milk denotes the innocency of children.' Clemens Alexandrinus[63] also takes notice of this custom, saying, 'As soon as we are born we are nourished with milk, which is the nutriment of the Lord. And when we are born again, we are honoured with the hope of rest by the promise of Jerusalem which is above, where it is said to rain milk and honey. For by these material things we are assured of that sacred food.' We learn further from the third Council of Carthage[64], that this milk and honey had a peculiar consecration distinct from that of the eucharist. It is there said 'to be offered at the altar on a day most solemn, (which means the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, which was the most solemn time of baptism,) and there to have its proper benediction for the mystery of infants, (that is, persons who are newly baptized, who are commonly called *infants* in the mystical sense,) that it might be distinguished from the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.' This part of the canon indeed is omitted in some Collections, but Labbe says it was in the ancient manuscripts, and it is now so read in the body of the African Code[65], which

suos abluit, nec oleum, quo suos unguit, nec mellis et lactis societatem, qua suos infantat, nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentat.

[62] In Esai. 55, 1. (t. 4. p. 644 c.) ... Lac, quod significat innocentiam parvulorum. Qui mos ac typus in Occidentis ecclesiis hodie usque servatur, ut renatis in Christo vinum lacque tribuatur. De quo lacte dicebat et Paulus, *Lac vobis potum dedi, non solidum cibum.* Et Petrus, *Quasi modo nati parvuli, rationale lac desiderate.*

[63] Pædagog. l. i. c. vi. p. 103. (p. 124. 38.) Τῷ οὖν γάλακτι, τῇ κυριακῇ τροφῇ, εὐθὺς μὲν ἀποκυηθέντες, τιθηνούμεθα· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀναγεννηθέντες τετιμήμεθα, τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τὴν ἐλπίδα, τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, ἐν ᾗ μέλι καὶ γάλα ὀμβρεῖν ἀναγέγραπται, διὰ τῆς ἐνύλου, καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν μνηστευόμενοι τροφήν.

[64] C. 24. (t. 2. p. 1170 e. Form. Canon. Antiquior.) Primitiæ vero, seu mel et lac, quod uno die solennissimo pro infantis mysterio solet offerri, quamvis in altari offeratur, suam tamen habet propriam benedictionem, ut a sacramento Dominici corporis aut sanguinis distinguatur.

[65] C. 37. ap. Justel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. (ap. CC. t. 2. p. 1067 e.) Ἀπαρχὴ δὲ, εἴτε μέλι, εἴτε γάλα, ὡς εἴωθε, προσφερέσθω ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἐθίμῳ εἰς τὸ τῶν νηπίων μυστήριον· εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα γάλα ἐνθυσιαστηρίῳ προσφέ-

puts the matter beyond all dispute. I have given this canon with a little explanatory paraphrase, because some learned men complain of the obscurity of it, and profess themselves to be in the dark about 'the mystery of infants,' which seems to me evidently to refer to this custom of giving milk and honey to the newly baptized.

Then required to say the Lord's Prayer.

7. When persons were thus adopted into God's family, and acknowledged as brethren in Christ, then they were admitted as sons to call upon God their Father, and immediately required to do it in the form of words taught us by Christ. The author of the Constitutions[66] bids them repeat the Lord's Prayer 'standing upright, because they were now risen with Christ from the dead:' and after that repeat this other short form: 'Almighty God, the Father of Christ, thy only-begotten Son, give me an immaculate body, a pure heart, a watchful soul, an unerring knowledge, with the influence of the Holy Ghost, that I may possess and enjoy the fulness of the truth, through thy Christ, by whom all glory be to thee in the Holy Ghost for ever. Amen.' St. Chrysostom[67] also mentions their repeating the Lord's Prayer presently after their coming up out of the water; and that, 'standing also, not falling upon their faces, but looking up to Christ, to whose body they are united, as he sits above in heaven, where Satan has no access.' And this was the first time they were allowed to use this prayer. For till men were baptized, and made sons of God by regeneration, they were not allowed to call God their Father. And though they learned the Lord's Prayer before baptism, yet they were not permitted till after baptism to use it as a prayer publicly in the Church.

ρεται, ὅμως ἰδίαν ἐχέτω κυρίως εὐλογίαν, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος τοῦ Κυριακοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος διϊστασθαι. [This is not found in Crabbe's Edition of the Councils, Colon. Agripp. 1551. t. 1. p. 428. Ed.]

[66] L. 7. c. 44. [Labb. c. 45.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.) *Μετὰ τοῦτο ἑστὼς προσευχέσθω τὴν εὐχὴν, ἣν ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος. Ἀναγκαίως δὲ τὸν ἀναστάντα δεῖ ἑστάναι καὶ προσεύχεσθαι, διὰ τὸ τὸν ἐγειρόμενον ὄρθιον εἶναι· καὶ αὐτὸς οὖν, συναποθανὼν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ συνεγερθεὶς, στηκέτω.*—C. 45. [Labb. c. 46.] *Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ σου, δός μοι σῶμα ἄσπιλον, καρδίαν καθαρὰν, νοῦν γρήγορον, γνῶσιν ἀπλανῆ, Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἐπιφοίτησιν πρὸς κτῆσιν καὶ πληροφορίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· δι' οὗ σοι δόξα ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.*

[67] Hom. vi. in Col. p. 1359. (t. 11. p. 370 b. 13.) *Εὐθέως γὰρ ἀνελθὼν, ταῦτα φθέγγεται τὰ ῥήματα· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Οὐκ ἐπ' ὄψιν πίπτει τὸ παιδίον, κ. τ. λ.*

Received with psalmody.

8. Among other ceremonies after baptism, Gregory Nazianzen[68] mentions their reception with psalmody, which he says, was '*a præludium* or *foretaste* of those hymns and praises which should be the employment of the life to come.' But whether this means any particular psalms appointed to be sung at baptism, or the common psalmody of the Church, he does not inform us. If I may be allowed to conjecture, I should conclude for the former, because the common psalmody of the Church was no more than what catechumens were allowed to hear before, as being part of the *missa catechumenorum*, or *first service*, at which not only catechumens, but professed Jews and Heathens might be present. Perhaps they sung the cxviiith Psalm, in which are these words, [v. 24.] "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it," because St. Austin[69] speaking of the Easter-festival seems to refer to it, saying, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made, higher than all, brighter than all, in which he hath acquired to himself a new people by the spirit of regeneration, and hath filled our minds with joy and gladness.' And Paulinus[70] speaks of singing Hallelujahs upon this occasion. But in doubtful matters I will not be over positive to determine.

And admitted immediately to the communion of the altar.

9. It is more certain, that, as soon as the ceremonies of baptism were finished, men were admitted to a participation of the eucharist. For this was τὸ τέλειον, *the perfection*, or *consummation* of a Christian, to which he was entitled by virtue of his baptism. Therefore all the ancient writers speak of this as the concluding privilege of baptism, which in those days was always immediately subjoined to it. And this was observed, not only with respect to adult persons, but children also. For proof of which custom at present it will be sufficient to allege the testimony of Gennadius[71], who joins the baptism of infants, and confirmation, and the eucharist all together. And this continued to the ninth century, as appears from the

[68] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 672 a.) . . . Ἡ ψαλμῳδία, μεθ' ἧς δεχθήσῃ, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ὑμνῳδίας προοίμιον.

[69] Serm. 163. de Temp. t. 10. p. 332. [al. Serm. 168. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 292 g.) Hic igitur est dies, dilectissimi, quem fecit Dominus, ut audistis, excelsior cunctis, lucidior universis, in quo Dominus resurrexit, in quo sibi novam plebem, ut ipsi videtis, regenerationis Spiritu conquisivit, &c.

[70] Ep. 12. ad Sever. (p. 145.)
Hinc senior sociæ congaudet turba catervæ,
Alleluia novis balat ovile choris.

[71] De Eccles. Dogmat. c.52. See before, ch. 1. s. 2. p. 199. n. 11.

Rituals of the age, some of which have been produced before[72] and many others might be added; but these belong to another place, where it will be more proper to treat of the communion of infants among other things that relate to the subject of the eucharist, which, together with the ancient psalmody, reading the Scriptures, preaching and prayers, which make up the whole ordinary service of the Church, under the names of *missa catechumenorum* and *missa fidelium*, will be the subject of the next volume[73], which is intended to give an account of the liturgy of the Church.

Of the ceremony of washing the feet, retained in some Churches.

10. There was one ceremony more, used in some Churches, but rejected by others, which it will not be improper to give some account of here in the close:—that was the custom of washing the feet of the baptized. Vicecomes thinks[74] at first it was a ceremony preceding baptism, and used on Maundy-Thursday, or the same day that our Saviour, from whose example it was taken, washed his disciples' feet. And this seems to be clear, he says, from St. Austin's words, who has

[72] B. 12. ch. 1. s. 2. p. 199. nn. 15 and 16, from Alcuin and the Ordo Romanus.

[73] [Book the 13th, following in this volume, but forming the fifth of the Author's original edition, London, 1719. The sixth of that, published the same year, and now the fifth of this edition, contains the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa fidelium*. Ed.]

[74] De Rit. Bapt. l. 3. c. 20. (p. 538.) *Quo die pedes abluerentur.* Cæterum Beroldus post baptismi ritus hanc cærimoniam refert; cum antiquitus die, Christi apostolorum pedes lavantis commemoratione celebri, præstari soleret, ut multis argumentis probare facile est. Nam pedum ablutio, quemadmodum supra diximus, ad detergendas corporis sordes, quæ baptizanti stomachum facere poterant, instituta videtur, quæ ratio post baptismum locum non habet. Deinde S. Ambrosius, Lib. 3. de Sacram. c. 2. et Lib. de Initiand. c. 6., locis, quæ attulimus, aperte significat, pedes ablui consuevisse, ut macula ortu contracta deleretur, cum post baptismum omnis peccati labes abolita sit. Palladius quoque [Histor. Lausiac. s. 73.] refert, duobus histrionibus ante pedes ablutos esse, tum salutare baptisma impertitum: ex quo ablutionem baptismo priorem fuisse omnes intelligunt. De die autem feriæ quintæ hebdomadis sanctioris, ut rationes eas, quæ e conjecturis pendent, omittamus, S. Augustini certissimum est testimonium, Epist. 118. ad Januar., quum ait: *Si autem quæris, &c.* (See next note.) Beroldus igitur solum sui temporis consuetudinem expressit; quod indicant ejus verba, cum baptismi trium puerorum meminit; qui antiquitus, quando in Paschate vel Pentecoste baptizabantur, in usu non erat; fieri enim potuit, ut quemadmodum, teste S. Augustino, (Epist. 119. ad Januar.,) honoris ergo, a die altero in alterum, ea consuetudo mutata est; sic etiam Mediolani ad cærimonias post baptismum delata sit, ut negligendi veri baptismi occasio demeretur. Et sic intelligendi sunt, quotquot eam cærimoniam post baptismum numerarunt, cum posteriorum temporum ratio habita sit.

occasion to mention it in two of his Epistles. But in the former Epistle[75] St. Austin is speaking of the custom of bathing the whole body before Easter, that the catechumens, who had neglected themselves in the observation of Lent, might not appear offensive, when they came to be baptized: therefore Maundy-Thursday was chosen as the day to cleanse themselves by bathing from the bodily filth, which they had contracted. And because this was allowed to the catechumens, many others chose to bathe themselves with them on that day also, and relax their fast, because fasting and bathing would not agree together. So that this washing was not the washing of the feet, however Vicecomes came to mistake it, but the bathing of the whole body; and not used as a religious ceremony, but as a ceremony of convenience and civil decency, that they might not be offensive to the senses of others, when they came to baptism. In the other Epistle[76] he speaks particularly of washing the feet, but that was after baptism, on the third day of the octaves, or such other time as those Churches which retained the ceremony thought fit to appoint it. For many Churches, he says, would never admit of this custom at all, lest it should seem to belong to the sacrament of baptism, when our Saviour only intended it as a lesson of humility. And other Churches for the same reason abrogated the custom, where it had been received. And others, who retained it, that they might recommend it by fixing it to some more sacred time, and yet distinguish it from the sacrament of baptism,

[75] Ep. 118. [al. 54.] ad Januar. p. 213. (t. 2. p. 127 e.) Si autem quæris, cur etiam lavandi mos ortus sit? nihil mihi de hac re cogitanti probabilius occurrit, nisi quia baptizandorum corpora per observationem Quadragesimæ sordidata, cum offensione sensus ad fontem tractarentur, nisi aliqua die lavarentur. Istum autem diem potius ad hoc electum, quo cœna Dominica anniversarie celebratur. Et quia concessum est hoc baptismum accepturis, multi cum his lavare voluerunt, jejuniumque relaxare.

[76] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Eund. c. 18. (p. 141 e.) De lavandis vero pedibus, cum Dominus hoc propter formam humilitatis, propter quam docendam venerat, commendaverit, sicut ipse consequenter exposuit, quæsitum est, quonam tempore potissimum res tanta etiam facto doceretur, et [in] illud tempus occurrit, quo ipsa commendatio religiosius inhæreret. Sed ne ad ipsum sacramentum baptismi videretur pertinere, multi hoc in consuetudinem recipere noluerunt. Nonnulli etiam de consuetudine auferre non dubitaverunt. Aliqui autem, ut hoc et sacratiore tempore commendarent, et a baptismi sacramento distinguerent, vel diem tertium octavarum, quia et ternarius numerus in multis sacramentis maxime excellit, vel etiam ipsum octavum, ut hoc facerent, elegerunt.

chose either the third day of the octaves, or the octave after baptism itself, as most convenient for this purpose.

Among the Churches which wholly refused or abrogated this custom, the Spanish Church is one, which in the Council of Eliberis made a canon against it; forbidding at once 'the exacting any gift or reward for administering baptism, lest the priest should seem to sell what he freely received;' (of which I have given a full account [77] in speaking of the revenues of the Church;) and also forbidding 'the priests [78] or any other of the clergy to wash the feet of such as were baptized.' Among those Churches which never received this custom, we may reckon the Roman Church; and among those which always received it, the Church of Milan, whose practice is opposed to the Roman by St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of the book *De Sacramentis, et de iis qui Mysteriis initiantur,* among his works. He says [79], in the Church of Milan the bishop was used to wash the feet of the baptized. But the Roman Church had not this custom: and he thinks they might decline it, because of the multitude of those that were baptized. But they of the Roman Church pleaded, 'that it was not to be done by way of mystery in baptism or regeneration, but only by way of humility, as the custom of washing the feet of strangers.' But on the contrary, the Church of Milan pleaded, 'that this was not merely a business of humility, but of mystery and sanctification, because Christ said to Peter, Except I wash thy feet, thou hast no part with me.' 'This I urge,' says our author, 'not to reprehend others, but to commend my own

[77] B. 5. ch. 4. s. 14. v. 2. p. 171.

[78] Vid. C. Eliber. c. 48. [juxt. Ed. Crabb. t. 1. p. 284. juxt. Ed. Labb. c. 38.] (t. 1. p. 975 e.) Emendari placuit, ut hi qui baptizantur, ut fieri solet, [al. solebat,] nummos in concham non mittant [al. immittant], ne sacerdos, quod gratis accepit, pretio distrahere videatur. Neque pedes eorum lavandi sunt a sacerdotibus vel [al. sed] clericis.

[79] L. 3. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 362 b. n. 4.) Succinctus Summus Sacerdos pedes tibi lavit.... Non ignoramus quod Ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur et formam: hanc tamen consuetudinem non habet, ut pedes lavet. Vide ergo ne propter multitudinem declinarit. Sunt tamen qui dicant, et excusare conentur, quia hoc non mysterio faciendum est, non in baptismate, non in regeneratione: sed, quasi hospiti, pedes lavandi sunt. Aliud est humilitatis, aliud sanctificationis. Denique audi, quia mysterium est, et sanctificatio: *Nisi lavero tibi pedes, non habebes mecum partem.* Hoc ideo dico, non quod alios reprehendam, sed mea officia ipse commendem. In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam, sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus. Ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos recte custodimus.

office. For though we desire to follow the Roman Church, yet we are men that have our senses about us. And therefore we observe that practice, which we conceive to be more correct in other Churches.' He adds further[80], 'that this was not done to obtain remission of sins, for that was already done in baptism: but because Adam was supplanted by the Devil, and the Serpent's poison was cast upon his feet, therefore men were washed in that part for greater sanctification, that he might have no power to supplant them any further.' These were the reasons given by the Church of Milan for their adhering to this practice: but they were not so strong as to prevail with others, and so this custom never got any great footing in the Christian Church.

A general reflection upon the whole preceding discourse, with relation to the practice of the present Church.

11. I have now gone over the most material ceremonies and usages of the Church observed about the administration of baptism, as well those that went before, as those that accompanied the action itself, and those that followed after; and, as near as I could, delivered them in the same order and manner as she herself observed them. And shall here close the discourse only with one general reflection, which may be of some use to vindicate the practice of the present Church, and give satisfaction to such sober dissenters as scruple our office of baptism, for the sake of an innocent significant ceremony or two retained in it. The candid reader may observe throughout this discourse, that not only one or two, but many significant ceremonies were observed by the ancient Church in the administration of baptism; particularly the sign of the cross was used at least four or five times in the whole process of the action. Therefore they, who now raise objections against the present office, had they lived in the primitive times, must have had much more reason to complain of the ancient practice. And yet we do not ordinarily find objections raised against the

[80] Ibid. (p. 364. n. 7.) In baptismate omnis culpa diluitur. Recedit ergo culpa; sed quia Adam supplantatus a Diabolo est, et venenum ei suffusum est supra pedes, ideo lavas pedes, ut in ea parte, in qua insidiatus est Serpens, majus subsidium sanctificationis accedat, quo postea te supplantare non possit. [He repeats this reason in his book de Initiatis, [sive de Mysteriis,] c. 6. (t. 2. p. 333. n. 32.) Mundus erat Petrus, sed plantam lavare debebat. Habebat enim primi hominis de successione peccatum; quando eum supplantavit Serpens et persuasit errorem. Ideo planta ejus abluitur, ut hereditaria peccata tollentur; nostra enim propria per baptismum relaxantur. Ed.]

baptism of the Church, upon the account of the ceremonies she used therein; no, not even by those who in other things differed from her. Which consideration, methinks, should a little satisfy those who really value the peace and unity of the Church, and be an argument to them not to dissent from the practice of the present Church, for those things which must more forcibly have obliged them to have been dissenters in all ages. I know not how far this consideration may prevail upon any, but I know how far it ought to prevail upon all that love the peace, and study the quiet of the Church, and therefore I could not but in this place here seasonably suggest it.

CHAP. V.

Of the laws against rebaptization both in Church and State.

But one baptism, properly so called, allowed by the Church: and why?

1. To what has been said about baptism, it will not be improper to add something about the laws made both in Church and State against the repetition of it, when once duly performed. The Ancients generally determine against a repetition of baptism; though Vossius[81] thinks their reasons are not always strictly conclusive. Some argued that baptism was not to be repeated, because we are baptized into the death of Christ, who died but once. So St. Basil[82] and St. Austin[83]. But Vossius thinks there is no weight in this argument, because that which is but once done may be often represented: as the sacrament of the eucharist is often repeated, though it

[81] De Bapt. disput. 17. thes. 5. p. 210. (t. 6. pp. 317, seqq.) Consult the Theses from 5 to 14 inclusive.

[82] De Spir. Sanct. c. 15. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 40 b. n. 35.) Ἓν οἴδαμεν τὸ σωτήριον βάπτισμα, ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου θάνατος, καὶ μία ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐξανάστασις, ὧν τύπος ἐστι τὸ βάπτισμα.

[83] De Ver. et Fals. Pœnitent. c. 3. (t. 6. append. p. 233 f.) Sicut enim semel Christus crucifixus est; sic baptismus iterandus non est. Una enim morte sua omnes redemit, ut amplius mori non oporteat. Quod videns ecclesia intellexit, non iterandum baptisma. [Conf. Isidor. Hispal. l. 2. de Offic. Eccles. c. 24. (p. 411 e.) Semel autem nos oportet in Christo lavari; quia Christus semel pro nobis mortuus est, Si enim unus Deus et fides una est, necessario et unum baptisma sit; quia et Christi mors una pro nobis est, in cujus imaginem mergimur per mysterium sacri fontis, ut consepeliamur Christo morientes huic mundo, et ab iisdem aquis, quibus in forma resurrectionis ejus emergimur, non reversuri ad corruptionem; sicut neque est reversus ad mortem.—Damascen. de Fid. Orthod. l. 4. c. 9. (t. 1. p. 259 d.) Ὥσπερ ἅπαξ ἐτελέσθη ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου θάνατος, οὕτως καὶ ἅπαξ δεῖ βαπτίζεσθαι. *Grischov.*]

also be in remembrance of the Lord's death till he come. Others prove it from those words of our Saviour, (John 13, 10.) "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." This argument is used by Optatus, St. Austin, Fulgentius, Pacianus, and St. Ambrose. But Vossius thinks there is as little force in this reason as the former: because men may become polluted and unclean after baptism, and so have need of a second washing, if there were no other reason against it. Others argued from those words of the Apostle, (Hebr. 6, 4.) "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened,...if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance." The ancient expositors, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, and Haimo, understand this as a prohibition of renewing men to repentance again by a second baptism; for they do not deny absolutely the possibility of a second repentance or pardon, but only upon a second baptism. And so, Vossius says, it is also expounded by Epiphanius [84], Cyril of Alexandria [85], St. Jerom [86], St. Austin [87], and St. Ambrose [88]. But he thinks their exposition not so agreeable to this place, as that of others, who interpret the "falling away," either to mean the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or what

[84] Hær. 59. Cathar. s. Novatian. n. 2. (t. 1. p. 494 b.) *Καὶ γὰρ τῷ μὲν ὄντι τοὺς ἅπαξ ἀνακαινισθέντας καὶ παραπεσόντας ἀνακαινίζειν ἀδύνατον. Οὔτε γὰρ ἔτι γεννηθήσεται Χριστὸς, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· οὔτε ἀνασταυροῦν δύναταί τις τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν μηκέτι σταυρούμενον· οὔτε δύναταί τις λουτρὸν δεύτερον λαμβάνειν· ἓν γάρ ἐστι τὸ βάπτισμα, καὶ εἷς ὁ ἐγκαινισμός. Ἀλλὰ εὐθὺς ἐπιφέρει τὴν τούτων ἴασιν ἅγιος Ἀπόστολος, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰατρεύων, καὶ τῶν αὐτῆς μελῶς ἐπιμελούμενος, καί φησι, Πεπείσμεθα, κ. τ. λ.*

[85] L. 5. in Ioan. 17. [This citation is altogether incorrect. Cyril's fifth book on John begins at the 25th verse of the 7th chapter. Neither does he cite Hebr. 6, 4, at all. In b. 11. ch. 9. on Joh. 17, 12. (t. 4. p. 975 b, et seqq.) there are remarks on the words *the son of perdition*, which possibly may have occurred to the author's mind. Ed.]

[86] Cont. Jovinian. l. 2. (t. 2. p. 325 a.) Impossibile est, &c.

[87] In Rom. (Expos. Inchoat. t. 3. part. 2. p. 937 g.) Non enim possunt denuo baptizari, qui semel baptizati sunt; quamvis etiam post baptismum per ignorantiam veritatis peccaverint. Ita fit, ut quoniam sine baptismo nemo recte dicitur accepisse scientiam veritatis, omnis qui accepit eam, non ei relinquatur pro peccatis sacrificium, hoc est, non possit denuo baptizari.—Ibid. (p. 938 b.) Eos enim, qui jam baptizati fuerint, curari melius dicimus per pœnitentiam; non renovari, quia renovatio in baptismo est. Ubi quidem operatur pœnitentia, sed tanquam in fundamento. Manente itaque fundamento, recurari ædificium potest: si autem fundamentum iterare quis voluerit, totum ædificium subvertat necesse est.

[88] De Pœnitent. cont. Novatian. l. 2. c. 2. [In Hebr. 6, 4, seqq.] (t. 2. p. 417 c, et seqq.) Cum igitur tam evidenter, &c.

St. John calls "a sin unto death," or a total apostasy from the Christian religion, for which there is no renewal of repentance. But I will not be so positive as Vossius, that any of these are better interpretations of that text, which is so unanimously urged by the Ancients against the Novatians, as a prohibition, not simply of a second repentance, but of a repentance by a second baptism. Others made use of those words of the Apostle, (Eph. 4. 5.) "one faith, one baptism." Which is the argument urged by Cyril of Jerusalem and Pope Leo against rebaptization. But this, as Vossius observes, probably was not intended as a prohibition of a second baptism, but only to declare the community of that baptism, which is received one and the same by all, without exception. As the Apostle calls the eucharist "one bread," not because it was only once to be received, but because it was that common bread of which all were partakers. The true reason, Vossius thinks, why baptism is not to be repeated, is the Divine will that so appointed it. For there is no command to reiterate baptism, as there is to repeat the eucharist, in the words of institution. Neither is there any example of any rebaptization in Scripture, though we often read of men's falling into gross and scandalous sins after baptism. To which may be added, that baptism succeeds in the room of circumcision, being the entrance and seal of the covenant, which, on God's part, is never broken: so that as circumcision was never repeated, though the Passover was yearly; in like manner men enter into the covenant by baptism, and their breaches of the covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms, but by confession and repentance, which is the method prescribed by the Apostle for restoring fallen brethren. St. Jerom[89] observes, that though there were many heretics in the Apostles' days, as the Nicolaitans and others, yet there was no command given to rebaptize them upon their repentance. And Optatus[90] makes the unity of circumcision

[89] Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 8. [al. c. 24.] (t. 2. p. 198 a.) De Apocalypsi quoque approbemus, hæreticis sine baptismate debere pœnitentiam concedi. . . . . Numquid dixit, Rebaptizentur, qui in Nicolaitarum fidem baptizati sunt?

[90] L. 1. p. 35. (p. 6.) Quid enim magis dici pro nobis, et nostrum esse potest, quam quod dixisti, in comparationem baptismatis semel factum esse diluvium? Et singularem circumcisionem salubriter profecisse populo Judæorum, magis pro nobis, quasi noster locutus es.

a good argument for the unity of baptism, in which both the Catholics and Donatists agreed. For though the Donatists rebaptized the Catholics, yet they did it not under the notion of a second baptism, but as supposing they had received no true baptism before.

Only the Marcionites allowed baptism to be thrice repeated.

2. Indeed among all the ancient heretics, we find none for a plurality of baptisms, but only the Marcionites. Which Epiphanius[91] observes to have been an invention of Marcion, their first founder, in regard to his own conversation: for he having been guilty of deflouring a virgin, invented a second baptism, asserting, that it was lawful to repeat baptism three times for the remission of sins. So that if any man fell, he might receive a second baptism after the first, and a third after that, upon his repentance. Which he pretended to ground upon those sayings of our Saviour, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and I have a cup to drink;" [Luke 12, 50.] which have no reference to any other baptism in water, but to his baptism in blood, that is, his death and passion. Of which the Ancients speak much, as they do of some other sorts of baptism, which are only metaphorical, as the baptism of afflictions, the baptism of tears and repentance, and the baptism of fire at the last day. But here the question is only about proper baptism by water, which the Marcionites affirmed might be repeated three times in the same way, which the Church never allowed of.

What the Church did in doubtful cases, not reckoned a rebaptization.

3. It is true indeed, there were some doubtful cases, in which it might happen accidentally that a man might be a second time baptized; but these were such cases only, in which the party was reputed not to have received any former baptism at all. As when a man could neither give any account of his own baptism, nor were there any other credible witnesses that could attest it. Which often happened to be the case of those, who were taken captives in their infancy, and made slaves by the heathen. When any such were redeemed or recovered by the Christians, the Church made no scruple to baptize them; because though they might perhaps have re-

[91] Hær. 42. Marcionit. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 304 c.) Ἐπειδὴ φθείρας ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πόλει τὴν παρθένον, καὶ ἀποδράσας μὲν ἐν παραπτώματι μεγάλῳ εὑρέθη, ἐπενόησεν ὁ ἀγύρτης ἑαυτῷ δεύτερον λουτρὸν, φήσας· Ὅτι ἔξεστιν ἕως τριῶν λουτρῶν, τουτέστι τριῶν βαπτισμῶν, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν δίδοσθαι· ἵν' εἴ τις παρέπεσεν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον, λάβῃ δεύτερον μετανοήσας, καὶ τρίτον ὡσαύτως, ἐὰν ἐν παραπτώματι μετὰ τὸ δεύτερον γένηται.

ceived a former baptism, yet no evidence of it appeared. And so this was not reputed a rebaptization. A decree was made to this purpose in the fifth Council of Carthage[91] upon a question put by the bishops of Mauritania, who affirmed that they redeemed many such captive children from the hands of the barbarians: the Council ordered, that 'in this case, as often as it happened that there were no certain witnesses found, who could give undoubted testimony of their baptism; nor were they able of themselves to affirm, by reason of their age, that they ever had received it; they should be baptized without any scruple, lest an hesitation in this case should deprive them of the purgation of the sacraments.' The like determination was also given in one of the Roman Synods under Leo[92] upon the same case, where it was concluded, that in such a doubtful case, neither the baptizer nor the baptized incurred the crime of rebaptization. And Leo resolves the matter himself after the same manner in other places[93]. Neither was it reckoned any crime, though it afterward appeared that the party had been baptized before, because it was done in ignorance: but yet, like clinic baptism, it was a sort of blemish to him, that deprived him of ecclesiastical promotion, except in some extraordinary case, as we learn from Theodore's *Pœnitentiale* cited by Gratian[94].

Nor when she baptized those, who had

4. Neither was it reckoned properly a second baptism, when the Church baptized any who had before been unduly baptized in heresy or schism. For then she did it only on presumption

[91] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 1216 c.) Placuit de infantibus, ut quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sint per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos, ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum, fratres nostri, consuluerunt, quia multos tales a barbaris redimunt.—Conf. Cod. Afric. c. 72. (ibid. p. 1094 c.) Ὁμοίως ἤρεσε περὶ τῶν νηπίων, κ. τ. λ.—See also C. Trull. c. 84. (t. 6. p. 1178 e.) where the same words are read.

[92] Ep. 37. ad Leon. Ravennat. (CC. t. 3. p. 1316 b.) Non potest in iterationis crimen devenire, quod factum esse omnino nescitur.

[93] Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 15. (ibid. p. 1408 d.) Si nulla existant [al. exstant] indicia inter propinquos aut familiares, nulla inter clericos aut vicinos, quibus hi, de quibus quæritur, baptizati fuisse doceantur; agendum est ut renascantur, ne manifeste pereant, in quibus quod non ostenditur gestum, ratio non sinit ut videatur iteratum.

[94] De Consecrat. distinct. 4. c. 117. (t. 1. p. 2018. 29.) Qui bis ignoranter baptizati sunt, non indigent pro eo pœnitere: nisi quod secundum canones ordinari non possunt, nisi magna aliqua necessitas cogat.

been unduly baptized before in heresy or schism.

that they had received no true baptism before. Some heretics corrupted baptism by altering the necessary form, and others corrupted it by changing the matter of it into some other substance of their own appointing: and the baptisms of all such were looked upon as no baptisms, and therefore the Church ordered all those to be baptized upon their return to her communion, in the very same manner as Jews and Gentiles, as supposing their former pretence of baptism to be nothing at all, but her own baptism the first true baptism that was given them. And even the Cyprianists, who baptized all that had been baptized in any heresy or schism whatsoever without distinction, did it still only upon this supposition, that the baptism which they had received before was no baptism at all, but a mere nullity. But if any had been baptized in the Catholic Church, and after that turned heretics or schismatics, or even apostates, Jews or Gentiles, they never gave such another baptism upon their return to the Church again.

Apostates never rebaptized in the Catholic Church.

5. For the Cyprianists in this agreed with the rest of the Catholic Church, that catholic baptism was never to be repeated in the greatest apostates. This doctrine is not only inculcated by St. Austin[95], but even by Cyprian himself and his followers, where they plead so much for baptizing those, who had been baptized in any heresy or schism; they still except those heretics, who had originally been baptized in the Catholic Church: though they turned apostates, they were not to be

[95] De Bapt. l. 2. c. 1. (t. 9. p. 96 e.) Si ergo potuit Petrus contra veritatis regulam, quam postea ecclesia tenuit, cogere gentes judaizare, cur non potuit Cyprianus contra regulam veritatis, quam postea tota ecclesia tenuit, cogere hæreticos vel schismaticos denuo baptizari?—Cont. Lit. Petilian. l. 2. c. 7. (p. 220 e.)... Hinc licet advertas, quod qui baptizati apostatant, et per pœnitentiam redeunt, non eis redditur baptismus, quem si amitterent, redderetur.—Ibid. c. 48. (c. 47. sub fin. p. 253 b.) ... Et tamen sive permanentibus, sive lapsis, cum ipsi non sint unum, baptismus unus est; et cum ipsi non utrique sancti sint, baptismus in utrisque sanctus est: quia et apostatæ si redeant, non, quasi eum amiserint, baptizantur, sed, quod in se permanenti injuriam fecerint, humiliantur.—Id. cont. Crescon. l. 2. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 419 b.) Unde fieri potest, ut quos seductos rebaptizaverunt, ipsi pro eis pœnitentibus Dominum deprecentur, si prius isti conciliati, quam illi reconciliati ecclesiæ fuerint. Sicut fieri potest, ut etiam cultores idolorum, si quos forte Christianos ad idola seductos apostatas fecerint, si priores seductores facti fuerint Christiani ... per ipsos illi, quos deceperant, redeant, per ipsos commendentur et reconcilientur Domino, per quos demiserant Dominum. Quod enim valet ad mundanda sacrilegia gentilium, recte perceptum sacramentum baptismatis, hoc valet ad mundanda sacrilegia schismaticorum et hæreticorum, veraciter apprehensa caritas unitatis.

received again by baptism, but only by repentance, as was determined in the Council of Carthage[96], over which Cyprian presided. St. Austin refers us to this very passage, and thence concludes this was a point agreed upon universally in the Catholic Church, that no lapse or crime could make it necessary to give a second baptism to any, who had once been truly baptized within the pale of the Church. A longer penance indeed was imposed upon such deserters and apostates, as had been baptized in the Church, than upon those who had been baptized among heretics originally, as the rules of Pope Innocent[97] inform us: the one were obliged to go through a long course of penance for their apostasy, but the other were admitted immediately by imposition of hands upon their recantation: yet still the Church kept strict to her rule, that whatever way she admitted them, she would not do it by a second baptism.

6. Several heretics pretended to observe the same rule: for they rebaptized the Catholics, yet they said this was not a second baptism; because the Catholics were reputed heretics with them, and therefore their baptism was of no value in their account. Upon this ground the Novatians rebaptized the

What heretics rebaptized the Catholics.

[96] Ap. Cypr. n. 8. p. 232. (p. 160.) Censeo omnes hæreticos et schismaticos, qui ad ecclesiam Catholicam voluerint venire, non ante ingredi, nisi exorcizati et baptizati prius fuerint; exceptis his sane, qui in ecclesia Catholica fuerint ante baptizati, ita tamen, ut per manus impositionem in pœnitentiam ecclesiæ reconcilientur.—Ibid. n. 22. (p. 162.) Censeo itaque flebiles et tabidos hæreticos baptizandos esse, cum ad ecclesiam venire cœperint; et sacra et divina lavatione lotos, et lumine vitæ illuminatos, . . . in ecclesiam recipi; absque his, qui de ecclesia fideles supplantati ad hæresis tenebras transierant; sed eos per manus impositionem restituendos.—Cypr. Ep. 71. ad Quint. p. 194. (p. 303.) Quod nos quoque hodie observamus, ut quos constet hic baptizatos esse, et a nobis ad hæreticos transiisse, si postmodum, peccato suo cognito et errore digesto, ad veritatem et matricem redeant, satis sit in pœnitentiam manum imponere; ut, quia ovis jam fuerat, hanc ovem abalienatam et errabundam in ovile suum pastor recipiat. Si autem, qui ab hæreticis venit, baptizatus in ecclesia prius non fuit, sed alienus in totum et profanus venit; baptizandus est, ut ovis fiat, quia una est aqua in ecclesia sancta, quæ oves faciat.—Id. Ep. 74. ad Pompeian. p. 216. (p. 318.) Observatur a nobis, et tenetur . . . ut omnes, qui ex quacunque hæresi ad ecclesiam convertuntur, ecclesiæ unico legitimo baptismo baptizentur, exceptis his, qui in ecclesia prius fuerant, &c.

[97] Ep. 2. ad Victricium, c. 8. (CC. t. 2. p. 1251 c.) Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus, per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur. Quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine, sunt baptizati: præter eos, si qui forte a nobis ad illos transeuntes rebaptizati sunt: hi, si resipiscentes, et ruinam suam cogitantes, redire maluerint [al. voluerint], sub longa pœnitentiæ satisfactione admittendi sunt.

Catholics, as we learn from Cyprian[98] and the Epistle of Pope Innocent last cited. The Donatists followed the Novatians in this sacrilegious practice, as the charge is often brought against them by St. Austin[99] and many others. And the Eunomians not only rebaptized the Catholics, but all others of the Arian sects, that were not of their own particular faction, as is noted by Epiphanius[1] in his account of them. And the other Arians, though they were at first averse to this practice, (as Papebrochius[2] and Pagi[3] rightly observe, in order to refute the story of Constantine's being baptized by Pope Sylvester, and rebaptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia; for at that time the Arians had not taken up the practice of rebaptizing the Catholics:) yet afterwards they gave way to it about the time of St. Austin. For he charges it upon them more than once[4], that they re-

[98] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 198. (p. 306.) Nec nos movet ... quod in literis tuis complexus es, Novatianenses rebaptizare eos, qnos a nobis solicitant.

[99] Cont. Fulgent. c. 7. (t. 9. append. p. 6 c.) Da mihi aliquem sanctorum post Trinitatem rebaptizare, quod facis.—De Hæres. c. 69. (t. 8. p. 21 e.) Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos: ubi se amplius hæreticos esse firmarunt, cum ecclesiæ Catholicæ universæ placuerit, nec in ipsis hæreticis baptisma commune rescindere.—Vid. Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 6. Ne sanctum baptisma iteretur, leg. 4. Honorii. (t. 6. p. 197.) In tantum sceleris progressi dicuntur ii, quos Donatistas vocant, ut baptisma sacrosanctum, mysteriis recalcatis, temeritate noxia, iterent, et homines semel, ut traditum est, munere divinitatis ablutos, contagione profanæ repetitionis infecerint: ita contigit, ut hæresis ex schismate nasceretur. Inde male credulas mentes ad spem secundæ indulgentiæ blandus error nvitat: &c.

[1] Hær. 76. Anomœan. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 992 b.) See before, b. 11. ch. 3. s. 10. p. 40. n. 33.

[2] Vit. Constant. Maii. 21. (Ed. Venet. t. 5. p. 17. ap. c. 2. n. 19.) Hinc porro intelligitur, inanem esse conatum quorundam paucorum, qui utramque de Constantini [sententiam] baptismo reconciliaturi, Romæ quidem a Silvestro baptizatum esse dicunt; sed Nicomediæ rebaptizatum ab Eusebio.

[3] Critic. in Baron. 324. n. 12. [al. 15.] (t. 1. p. 400.) Neque audiendi, qui utramque de Constantini baptismo sententiam conciliaturi, Romæ quidem a Silvestro baptizatum esse dicunt, sed Nicomediæ rebaptizatum ab Eusebio. Nam rebaptizationem ab Arianis, ante Vandalicæ persecutionis tempora, tentatam nemo cum fundamento dixerit, nec debet, tota antiquitate silente, recipi: multo minus, eam jam a tempore Constantini imperatoris usurpatam. Quis enim, eo vivente, ausus fuisset Nicenæ fidei professores, quam ille semper et ubique spectabat, et omnino sartam tectam volebat, affirmare hæreticos, quorum proinde baptismus invalidus crederetur? Ut autem Ariani jam tunc tale quidpiam clam ausi essent, necdum posset dici, quod Eusebius, Arianismi notam conatu omni a sese tunc adhuc amoliri studens, partem habuerit in ea impietate, ut ait Papebrochius in Vita S. Constantini M., die 21. mensis Maii, ex quo hæc de Constantini baptismo exscripsi, ne acta agerem.

[4] De Hæres. c. 49. (t. 8. p. 18 b.) Rebaptizari quoque ab his Catholicos novimus, utrum et non Catholicos nescio.—De Quinque Hæres. Orat.

baptized the Catholics. And it appears from Victor Uticensis[5] that they insisted stiffly upon it in the time of the Vandalic persecution, and we afterwards meet with the same in the Epistles of Vigilius[6]. Valesius[7] cites the life of Fulgentius and the author of the *Breviarium Fidei*, published by Sirmondus, to the same purpose. By which last author[8] we find, that the Arians not only rebaptized the Catholics, but also made an argument of it, (as some Romanists in another case have since argued against the Protestants,) that their baptism was better than the Catholics', because the Catholics never rebaptized those that came over from the Arians, but reconciled them only by imposition of hands: but the Arians whenever they could

c. 7. (ap. Ed. Bened. int. Subdititia, t. 8. append. p. 10 g.) Speluncam* fabricat, illic Catholicum præfocat, Christianum vocat paganum, baptizato ingerit baptismum, contra id quod scriptum est, *Qui semel lotus est non indiget denuo lavari.*

[5] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 1. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 7. p. 590. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 677 c. 1.) Apprehendens Sebastianus, [a Geiserico rege monitus itaque ut ad Arianorum sacra transiret,] mundissimum panem similaceum, ita fatus est: Hic panis, ut ad tantum decorem veniret, et mensæ regiæ necessarius haberetur, discussa spuria furfuris, ex massa similaginis conspersus, per aquam transivit et ignem: idcirco et adspectu clarus, et esu suavis habetur. Ita et ego, mola Catholicæ matris commolitus, et cribro examinationis, ut simila munda, purgatus, rigatus sum aqua baptismatis, et igne Sancti Spiritus coctus. Et ut hic panis de furno, ita et ego per officia sacramentorum divinorum, artifice Deo, de fonte mundus ascendi. Sed fiat, si velis, quod ipse propono. Iste panis confringatur in frusta, madidetur aqua, iterum conspergatur, et mittatur in furnum. Si melior exierit, faciam quod hortaris.

[6] Ep. 2. ad Eleutherium, c. 3. (CC. t. 5. p. 312 e.) De his etiam, qui, baptismatis gratia salutaris accepta, apud Arianos iterum baptizati, &c.—C. Tolet. 3. Præfat. (t. 5. p. 997 c. seqq.) [But I find nothing there to the purpose. See Ep. C. Roman. ad Gratian. et Valentin. Imperatores. (t. 2. p. 1002 c.) Per Africam rursum sacrilegos rebaptizatos nutu Dei præcepistis expelli, &c. Ed.]

[7] Not. in Sozom. l. 6. c. 26. (t. 2. p. 253. n. 4.) Ariani Catholicos ad se venientes rebaptizabant, ut notum est. Qua de re locus est illustris in Breviario Fidei adversus Arianos, quod olim edidit Jacobus Sirmondus. *Dicere etiam solent de baptismo*, &c. Idem testatur vetus auctor vitæ Sancti Fulgentii, c. 21.

[8] Brev. Fid. adversus Arianos (ap. Oper. Sirmond. t. 1. p. 398 d, c.—Opuscul. t. 1. p. 131.) Dicere etiam solent de baptismo, quod in eo melius sit ipsorum [al. illorum] baptismum, quam nostrum; quia qui de illis ad nos convertuntur, non eos rebaptizamus, sed per manus impositionem reconciliamus. Illi vero si quos de nostris seducere possint, inconsideranter rebaptizant.

* [*Spelunca hæc intelligenda Arianorum ecclesia.* Ed. Bened. in margin. ibid.—Conf. Serm. de Symbol. contr. Judæos, Paganos, et Arianos, c. 22. (ibid. append. p. 20.) . . . Frustra sibi nomen ecclesiæ imponit. Video equidem te, o spelunca subdola, decipiens quia decepta; video quidem, quod aptes formam tuam sub specie aliena. Ed.]

seduce any from the Catholics, always gave them a second baptism.

What punishments were inflicted on the baptizers, by the laws of Church and State.

7. Now to prevent this petulant humour from spreading in the Church, many and severe laws were made against it, both by the ecclesiastical and the secular power. The Church by her canons[9] not only censured and condemned all such rebaptizations, as impious and sacrilegious, as a crucifying of Christ again, a doing despite to the Spirit, as a mockery of the divine mysteries, and derision of holy things; but also inflicted penalties on all those, who were either actively or passively concerned in them. The Council of Lerida[10] forbids the faithful so much as to eat with persons that suffered themselves to be rebaptized. The canons of Pope Innocent[11] enjoin them a long penance to make satisfaction. And those of Pope Leo[12] require even those, who through fear or terror were rebaptized against their wills, to do penance at the discretion of the bishop, before they were admitted again to communion. If they were bishops, presbyters, or deacons, who thus suffered themselves to be rebaptized, then they were to be degraded, and obliged to do penance all their lives, without being suffered to communicate with the Church either in the prayers of the faithful, or the prayers of the catechumens, and were only to be admitted to lay-communion at the hour of death, because they had not only denied their orders, but their Christianity, and openly professed themselves Pagans, by being rebaptized. This we find

9 Vid. Cod. Eccles. Afric. c. 52. [al. 48.] (t. 2. p. 1071 d.) *Ὥστε μὴ ἐξεῖναι γίνεσθαι ἀναβαπτίσεις.*—Constit. Apost. l. 6. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 344.) *Ὁμοίως καὶ βαπτίσματι ἑνὶ ἀρκεῖσθαι μόνῳ, τῷ εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου θάνατον δεδομένῳ· . . . μήτε τὸ παρὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἀκυροῦσθω διὰ δευτέρου· . . . ὡς γὰρ . . . εἷς ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐν σώματι θάνατος, οὕτως ἓν καὶ τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν διδόμενον βάπτισμα. . . . Τοὺς μεμυημένους ἐκ δευτέρου βαπτίζειν πειρώμενοι ἀνασταυροῦσι τὸν Κυρίον, ἀναιροῦσιν αὐτὸν ἐκ δευτέρου, γελῶσι τὰ θεῖα, μυκτηρίζουσι τὰ ἅγια, ὑβρίζουσι τὸ Πνεῦμα, τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὡς κοινὸν, ἀτιμάζουσιν.*

10 C. 14. (t. 4. p. 1613 c.) Cum rebaptizatis fideles religiosi nec in cibo participent.

11 Ep. 2. ad Victricium, c. 9. [juxt. Ed. Crabb.] Qui rebaptizati sunt, sub longa pœnitentia et satisfactione admittendi sunt. [According to Labbe, c. 8. (t. 2. p. 1251 c.) where the entire passage reads thus: Ut venientes a Novatianis et Montensibus per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur: quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine, sunt baptizati: præter eos si qui forte a nobis ad illos transeuntes rebaptizati sunt. Hi, si resipiscentes et ruinam suam cogitantes redire voluerint, sub longa pœnitentiæ satisfactione admittendi sunt. Ed.]

12 Ep. 77. ad Nicetam, c. 6. (CC. t. 3. p. 1372 d.) Qui ad iterandum baptismum vel metu coacti sunt . . . non nisi per pœnitentiæ remedium, et per impositionem episcopalis manus, communionis recipiant unitatem.

in the decrees of Felix the Third, made in a Roman Council[13] with respect to the African Churches, where such rebaptizations were often practised by the power of the Arians, who compelled the Catholics to be rebaptized. This was the ancient discipline of the Church toward those, who were only passive in admitting a second baptism, after they had once been truly baptized with Catholic baptism before.

Then again for those who were actively concerned in such rebaptizations, the Canons[14] appointed, 'that if any bishop or presbyter presumed to give a second baptism after a true one once received, he should be degraded:' and this penalty was confirmed by the Civil Law; for Valentinian put forth an edict against such rebaptizers, declaring them unworthy of the priesthood[15]. But because such sort of penalties did not much affect either the Donatists or Eunomians, who were already out of the Church, and little regarded her censures: therefore Honorius reinforced the former laws by adding a civil penalty to them. For in two laws[16] made against the Donatists, who were chiefly concerned in this crime, he enacted, that it should be confiscation of all a man's goods, whoever was found to rebaptize another. And Theodosius Junior[17], laid the same

[13] Ep. 1. c. 2. (CC. [c. 7.] t. 4. p. 1076 b.) Eos, quos episcopos, presbyteros, vel diaconos fuisse constiterit, et seu optantes forsitan seu coactos lavacri illius unici salutarisque claruerit fecisse jacturam; et Christum, quem non solum dono regenerationis, verum etiam gratia percepti honoris induerant, exuisse; cum constet neminem ad secundam tinctionem venire potuisse, nisi se palam Christianum negaverit, et professus fuerit se esse paganum; . . . usque ad exitus sui diem, [in pœnitentia,] si resipiscunt, jacere conveniet, nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est.

[14] C. 47. [Labb. c. 46.] (Cotel. [c. 39.] v. 1. p. 444.) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα, ἐὰν ἄνωθεν βαπτίσῃ . . . καθαιρείσθω.

[15] Vid. Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 6. De non iterando baptismo, leg. 1. (t. 6. p. 193.) Antistitem, qui sanctitatem baptismi iterata usurpatione geminaverit, et contra instituta omnium eam gratiam iterando contaminaverit, sacerdotio indignum esse censemus.

[16] Ibid. 4. (p. 197.) Quisquis post hæc fuerit rebaptizasse detectus . . . facultatum omnium publicatione mulctatus, inopiæ pœnam expendat. —Conf. ibid. leg. 5. Honorii. (p. 198.) Ne divinam gratiam sub repetito baptismate pollutam Donatistarum secreta violarent, et fallendi occasionem severitate hujus præceptionis abolemus, statuentes, ut cætera hujusmodi homines pœna sequatur, legisque censuram experiantur ultricem, qui in Catholicam religionem perverso dogmate commisissent. Jubemus igitur, ut, si quis posthac fuerit rebaptizasse detectus, judici, qui provinciæ præsidet, offeratur, ut facultatum omnium publicatione mulctatus inopiæ pœnam expendat.

[17] Ibid. leg. 7. Theodosii. (p. 201.) Nefarios Eunomianorum cœtus, ac funesta conventicula penitus arceri

penalty upon the Eunomians, and those that were rebaptized by them, commanding their goods to be confiscated, and their persons to be banished. Such was the care both of the civil and ecclesiastical governors to preserve the unity of baptism in the Catholic Church. But as Gothofred[18], I think, rightly observes, these laws seem only intended against heretics rebaptizing Catholics. For if heretics rebaptized heretics, as the Eunomians did the other Arians; it does not appear, that in that case the penalties of these laws affected them, but only were designed to restrain their insolencies against the Catholic Church. Some Catholics continued still, after the Cyprianic way, to rebaptize all heretics and schismatics whatsoever, without distinguishing those that were baptized in the name of the Trinity from those that were not: and though this was contrary to the general custom and discipline of the Church, yet I conceive the penalties of these laws did not affect them either. And the same may be said of those, who thought themselves obliged to rebaptize those, who were only baptized by laymen. For though it was reckoned a rebaptization by those Churches which practised otherwise, yet it was not that criminal rebaptization, against which these laws were chiefly intended: and these being something more of doubtful and disputed cases, about which good Catholics themselves were divided, a greater allowance was made in these, so long as men only observed the custom and practice of the Churches, in which they lived, about them: which was St. Basil's advice to the Churches of Asia, which were divided upon these questions.

jubemus eos, qui episcoporum, seu clericorum, vel ministrorum nomine usurpato, hujusmodi cœtibus præsunt... cum in hoc fuerint scelere deprehensi, stilum proscriptionis incurrere, et bonorum amissione coerceri. Eos vero qui fide, ut dictum est, imbutos immani furore rebaptizare deteguntur, cum his qui rebaptizantur [arceri jubemus].

[18] [Not. ad Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 6. leg. 6. (ibid. p. 200.) De cætero observandum, hanc pœnam imponi severissimam, non omnibus baptisma iterantibus, verum his, qui orthodoxorum ritu seu mysteriis jam initiatos baptizarent; ... procul dubio enim impune cessit rebaptizantibus, si quos ex hæreticis, veluti Arianis, ad sectam suam concedentibus rebaptizassent; quod Eunomianos fecisse ostendi ad l. 17. supr. de Hæreticis. *Grischov.*]

The end of the fourth volume of the original edition, Lond. 1715. 8*vo.*

BOOK XIII.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO DIVINE WORSHIP IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Some necessary remarks upon the ancient names of divine service, which modern corruptions have rendered ambiguous.

WE have hitherto seen the method of introducing men into the Church, through the various steps of their catechumenship, and baptism, and confirmation: we are now to view their practice in the worship of God after their admission, and to examine into the manner of their holding religious assemblies, and performing there the several public offices of divine service. Some things of this kind are general considerations, that run through all offices, and relate to every part of divine worship, such as the object of their worship, and the circumstances of language, and forms, and habits, and gesture, and time; and therefore of these general things I shall discourse first in this Book. After this I shall consider the several parts of their most solemn worship on the Lord's-day; such as their psalmody, and reading of the Scriptures, and preaching and prayer, and receiving the communion, which were their solemn acts of worship on every festival. And, because some of these were such as the catechumens and all others were allowed to be present at for their benefit and edification, whilst other parts of divine service were more restrained to persons baptized, who were complete and perfect Christians, (who were therefore called *communicants*, because they had a more peculiar right to all the privileges of Christian communion,) I shall upon this account speak of their worship under these two heads, according

The partition of this work.

to their own distinction: the *missa catechumenorum*, and the *missa fidelium*, *the service of the catechumens*, and *the service of the communicants*; or, as we may otherwise term them, *the ante-communion-service*, and *the communion-service*.

Of the *missa catechumenorum*, or first part of divine service, to which all orders of men were admitted.

2. The *missa catechumenorum* comprehended all that part of the service which preceded the common prayers of the communicants at the altar; that is, the psalmody, the reading of the Scriptures, the sermon, and the particular prayers that were made over the catechumens and other orders of penitents, energumens, &c., before they were dismissed. For, by the ancient rules and discipline of the Church, the method of divine service was so ordered that all persons, except some very scandalous sinners, had liberty to be present at some parts of it. The psalms, and lessons, and sermons were for the instruction, not only of believers, but also of catechumens and Heathens, Jews and infidels, unbelievers and heretics: and therefore by some canons all these had liberty to stay in the church till this part of the service, called *missa catechumenorum*, was ended. The fourth Council of Carthage has a rule[1] to this purpose, 'that the bishop shall not prohibit any one to enter the church, and hear the word of God, whether he be Gentile, Jew, or heretic, till the service of the catechumens was ended.' A like canon was made by the first Council of Orange[2], 'that the catechumens should have the liberty to stay and hear the Gospels read in all their churches.' The Council of Valentia[3], in Spain, extends the privilege to heretics and Heathens, as well as catechumens, and therefore orders, that the Gospel should be read before the oblation was brought forth, in the usual order of the lessons, so that not only the communicants, but the catechumens and penitents, and Gentiles, and heretics,

[1] C. 84. (t. 2. p. 1206 d.) Ut episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi ecclesiam, et audire verbum Dei sive gentilem, sive hæreticum, sive Judæum, usque ad missam catechumenorum.

[2] C. 18. (t. 3. p. 1450 c.) Evangelia placuit deinceps catechumenis legi apud omnes provinciarum nostrarum ecclesias.

[3] C. 1. (t. 4. p. 1617 d.) ..... Ut sacrosancta evangelia ante munerum illationem in missa catechumenorum in ordine lectionum post apostolum legantur; quatenus salutaria præcepta Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel sermones sacerdotis, non solum fideles sed etiam catechumeni ac pœnitentes, et omnes qui ex diverso sunt, audire licitum habeant. Sic enim, pontificum prædicatione audita, nonnullos ad fidem attractos evidenter scimus.

who were of the contrary part, might have liberty to hear the saving precepts of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the sermons of the bishops. For they had learned by experience, that by the bishops' preaching many had been brought over to the faith. And by this we may interpret an obscure canon of the Council of Lerida[4], which orders, 'that incestuous persons, so long as they continued in their sin, should not be permitted to stay any longer in the church, save only during the service of the catechumens, that is, to hear the psalmody, the lesson and the sermon.' St. Chrysostom[5] abundantly confirms this observation: for in many of his homilies he speaks not only of catechumens, but of heretics and Heathens being present as part of his auditory. Particularly, in his Homily[6] upon the forty-fourth Psalm, he wishes all the Jews and Heathens had been then present to have heard him expound that prophetical psalm of Christ. In another Homily[7] upon the forty-eighth Psalm he brings in an Heathen using this point of complaint against Christians: 'I went into a Christian church, and there I heard Paul say to their women, that they should not adorn themselves with gold or pearl; but I saw every thing contrary in

[4] C. 4. (ibid. p. 1611 e.) De his, qui se incestus pollutione commaculant, placuit, ut quousque in ipso detestando et illicito carnis contubernio perseverant, usque ad missam tantum catechumenorum in ecclesia admittantur.

[5] Hom. 41. de Pelag. t. 1. p. 560. (t. 2. p. 590 c.) Νῦν δὲ ἐννοήσατε, ὅτι πολλοὶ τῶν αἱρετικῶν εἰσιν ἡμῖν ἀναμεμιγμένοι.—Hom. 72. de Phoc. t. 1. p. 878. (ibid. p. 707 b.) ... Ἐνταῦθά μοι τὸν αἱρετικὸν κάλει, ἐάν τε παρῇ, ἐάν τε μὴ παρῇ· ἐάν τε γὰρ παρῇ, παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας φωνῆς παιδευέσθω· ἐάν τε μὴ παρῇ, διὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀκροάσεως μανθανέτω.—Hom. 7. [in illud, Si possibile est, &c.] t. 5. p. 124. (t. 3. p. 15 c.) Εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ αἱρετικοὺς παρόντας ἐπιπηδῆσαι τοῖς εἰρημένοις, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἀφελεστέρων ἀδελφῶν ἐντεῦθεν ὑποσκελίζειν. —Hom. de Prophet. Obscuritat. t. 3. p. 926. (t. 6. p. 172 c.) Δεῖ γὰρ καὶ εὐθύνας ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτεῖσθαι, εἰ καὶ ἐν φίλοις λέγομεν· καὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ ἴσως καὶ τῶν οὐ φίλων πάρεισι.

[6] Hom. in Ps. 44. t. 3. p. 206. (t. 5. p. 160 b.) Ἐβουλόμην παρεῖναι νυνὶ Ἰουδαίους ἅπαντας καὶ Ἕλληνας, καὶ, τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο παρὰ Ἰουδαίων λαβὼν, οὕτως ἀναγνῶναι τὸν ψαλμόν. .... Ἀλλ' εἴτε πάρεισιν, εἴτε μὴ πάρεισιν οὗτοι, ἡμεῖς τὸ ἡμέτερον ποιήσωμεν, καὶ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἁψώμεθα.

[7] Hom. in Ps. 48. [al. 49.] t. 3. p. 806. (ibid. p. 513 b.) [juxt. Ed. Savil. Hom. 19. t. 5. Serm. 1. in dictum, Ne timueris, &c. p. 119. 24.] Εἰσέρχῃ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κεχρυσωμένη τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὸν τράχηλον. Ἐὰν ἔλθῃ Παῦλος ..... βοᾷ καὶ λέγει ὡσαύτως· Τὰς γυναῖκας κοσμεῖν ἑαυτὰς χρὴ μὴ ἐν χρυσῷ, μὴ ἐν μαργαρίταις, μὴ ἐν ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ. Εἶτα ἂν εἰσέλθῃ ὁ Ἕλλην, καὶ ἴδῃ ἄνω μὲν φορούσας ταῦτα ἐκείνας, κάτω δὲ Παῦλον ταῦτα λέγοντα, οὐκ ἐρεῖ, ὅτι σκηνὴ καὶ μῦθος ταῦτά ἐστιν: οὐκ ἔστι μὲν σκηνὴ τὰ ἡμέτερα, κἂν οὕτω ταῦτα γίνηται· ὁ δὲ Ἕλλην βλάπτεται καὶ λέγει, Εἰσῆλθον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν Χριστιανῶν, καὶ ἤκουσα Παύλου λέγοντος, Μὴ ἐν χρυσῷ, μηδὲ ἐν μαργαρίταις, τὴν δὲ διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐναντία ἐπιδεικνυμένην.

their practice.' 'And,' says Chrysostom, 'will not the Heathen, when he comes into the church, and sees the women thus adorned in the galleries above, and hears Paul thus speaking below, be ready to say, our religion is mere pageantry and fable? It is not so indeed; but the Heathen is scandalized and offended at this contrariety in our practice.' This plainly implies, that the Heathens had free liberty to come into the Christian churches, and hear the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached. And it is very remarkable, what Sozomen[7] observes of St. Chrysostom, 'that by this means he brought over many of those, who heard him in the church, to acknowledge the divinity of Christ.' Which some understand of the scholars of Libanius, but Valesius[8], I think more truly, interprets it of Heathens and heretics in general, who flocked to St. Chrysostom's church to hear him.

There is but one thing that can be said against all this, and that is, that the Council of Laodicea has a contrary canon[9], which absolutely forbids the permitting of heretics to enter into the house of God. But this is only a local ordinance; and the thing being a matter of pure discipline, there might be prudential reasons for denying heretics in some places the privilege that was allowed them in others. Or else the canon may be understood of not permitting them to come into the church for prayers or communion, which was a thing forbidden by all canons whatsoever, till after their recantation. Some indeed think, that in Tertullian's time the catechumens were excluded before sermon, because he objects it to the heretics[10], 'that there were such confusions in their assemblies, that no one could tell who was a catechumen, and who was a communicant, because they all met, and heard, and prayed together;

[7] L. 8. c. 2. (v. 2. p. 325. 46.) Πλείστους δὲ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀκουόντων ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας εἰς ἀρετὴν ὠφέλησε, καὶ ὁμόφρονας αὐτῷ περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐποίησε.

[8] [Ad loc. (ibid. n. 2.) Ioannes Langus, qui Nicephorum Latini interpretatus est, hæc de Libanii discipulis dici existimavit, qui, cum Ioannem publice in ecclesia docentem audire consuevissent, ad Christi fidem conversi sunt. Præstat tamen hæc de cunctis generaliter, tam paganis, quam hæreticis, intelligere, qui ad Ioannem audiendum confluebant. Ed.]

[9] C. 6. (t. 1. p. 1497 a.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ συγχωρεῖν τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[10] De Præscript. c. 41. (p. 217 b.) In primis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, [pariter audiunt,] pariter orant: etiam ethnici si supervenerint, sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras, jactabunt.

and Heathens, if they came in among them, were not excluded from the very mysteries of their religion.' But in this, as Schelstrate[11] has observed against Albaspinæus and Christianus Lupus, Tertullian does not object to the heretics, that they admitted catechumens to hear their sermons, but that they made no distinction in their assemblies, as the Church did; but without any observation of decency or order, suffered their catechumens to mingle themselves with communicants, whom the Catholics always confined to a separate place in the church, while heretics admitted them confusedly, not only to hear sermons but to be present at their prayers and the oblation of the eucharist also. So that this passage of Tertullian rather confirms the thing asserted, that the *missa catechumenorum*, or *service of the catechumens*, lasted to the end of the sermon. After which it was usual for the deacon to call to the Heathens and heretics, if there were any present, to be gone: Μή τις τῶν ἀκροωμένων· μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων· *Let none that are only hearers, none of the unbelievers, be present!* as the author of the Constitutions[12] words it. Then followed the prayers for the catechumens of the order called *prostrators;* and after their dismission, prayers for the energumens; and after them, the prayers for the candidates of baptism, and last of all the prayers for the penitents. All which was included in the general name of *missa catechumenorum, the service of the catechumens*, or *ante-communion-service.*

Of the *missa fidelium*, or *communion-service*, peculiar to communicants only.

3. After this was ended, it was usual for the deacon to make another solemn proclamation to all orders of non-communicants to withdraw: Οἱ ἀκοινώνητοι περιπατήσατε· *Ye that cannot communicate, walk off and be gone!* 'Let no catechumen be present, no hearer, no infidel, no heterodox or heretical person;' as the author of the Constitutions[13] words it. And, as St. Chrysostom[14] acquaints us, he was used to add further, Ἐπι-

[11] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 4. c. 5. de Missa Catechumen. n. 3. (p. 200.) At illis verbis non insimulat Tertullianus catechumenos, quod ecclesiam adeant, vel in illa audiant, sive orent, sed quod sese cum fidelibus miscerent, nec observato narthecis loco in ipsa interiori ecclesia, ac si fideles essent, audirent, et sacrificio interessent. Et hoc vult Tertullianus, cum scribit, *pariter audiunt;* ac si diceret, *Separatim et in alio loco audire potuisse catechumenos.*

[12] L. 8. c. 5. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 392.)

[13] Ibid. c. 12. (p. 398.) Μή τις τῶν κατηχουμένων· μή τις τῶν ἀκροωμένων· μή τις τῶν ἑτεροδόξων.

[14] Hom. 1. [juxt. Ed. Savil. Hom. 6.] cont. Judæos, t. 1. p. 440. (t. 1. p.

γινώσκετε ἀλλήλους·—'Ye that are communicants discern and know one another: see that there be no catechumen, none of those that cannot eat of the sacrifice, no spy, no one that cannot see the heavenly blood shed for the remission of sins, no one unworthy of the living sacrifice, no unbaptized person, no one that may not touch the tremendous mysteries with his polluted lips.' And here began the *missa fidelium*, or *communion-service*, so called, because none might be present at it but communicants only, as appears from these solemn forms of dismissing all others before it began. This contains all those prayers which were said at the altar, and were properly called εὐχαὶ πιστῶν, *prayers of the faithful* or *communicants*, in opposition to the prayers of the catechumens, which went before: these were the prayers for the whole state of the Church, and peace of the world, which preceded the oblation and consecration of the eucharist; and then the consecration prayers, and prayers again for all orders of men in the Church, with proper forms of communicating, and doxologies, hymns, and thanksgivings after reception; of which we discourse particularly in the last of these Books, [viz. Book 15.] under the general title of *missa fidelium*, or *communion-service*.

This part of the service, being wholly spent in prayers, and that by the communicants only, is therefore peculiarly distinguished by the name of εὐχαὶ πιστῶν, *the prayers of the faithful*, by the Council of Laodicea[15], which speaks of them as coming after the prayers of the catechumens and their dismission. In other canons they are called *the common prayers of the people*, and absolutely *the prayers*, without taking notice of any other prayers in the Church. Whence in the Council of Nice[16], speaking of penitents, the phrase, 'communicating

593 b.) Οὐχ ὁρᾶτε ἐπὶ τῶν μυστηρίων, τί βοᾷ συνεχῶς ὁ διάκονος; Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους, κ. τ. λ.—Hom. 37. [Savil. 96.] de Fil. Prod. t. 6. p. 375. (t. 8. int. Spur. p. 37 a.) Μή τις κατηχουμένων, μή τις τῶν μὴ ἐσθιόντων, μή τις τῶν κατασκόπων, . . . μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων θεάσασθαι τὸ οὐράνιον αἷμα, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, μή τις ἀνάξιος τῆς ζώσης θυσίας, μή τις ἀμύητος, μή τις μὴ δυνάμενος ἀκαθάρτοις χείλεσι προσψαύσασθαι τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων.

[15] C. 19. (t. 1. p. 1500 c.) Περὶ τοῦ δεῖν ἰδίᾳ πρῶτον, μετὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχὴν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι· καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς κατηχουμένους, τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὴν εὐχὴν γίνεσθαι· καὶ τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα καὶ ὑποχωρισάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς· μίαν μὲν τὴν πρώτην διὰ σιωπῆς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην διὰ προσφωνήσεως πληροῦσθαι, εἶθ' οὕτως τὴν εἰρήνην δίδοσθαι.

[16] C. 11. (t. 2. p. 241 b.) Ὅσοι οὖν

in prayers with the people without the oblation,' denotes joining in this part of the service of the Church, distinguished by the name of *prayers*, or *communion-service*, which belonged not to the catechumens, but the body of the people, in which the penitents of the highest class, called *costanders*, were allowed to join, though they might neither make their oblations, nor partake of the eucharist with the faithful. And in the same sense the Council of Ancyra[17] speaks of penitents, who as they were to be 'three years substrators among the catechumens, and bow down under the bishops' hands for benediction;' so were they 'for two years to communicate in prayers only without the oblation.' And so 'communicating in prayers with the people' is taken in the Council of Antioch, when they say[18], 'All such as come to church, and hear the Holy Scriptures read, but will not communicate in prayers with the people, or withdraw themselves disorderly from partaking of the eucharist, shall be cast out of the church.' Where, as *reading of the Scriptures* is put for the whole service of the catechumens, which was the first service; so *communicating in prayers and the eucharist* denotes the second part of the service, peculiar to communicants, or persons baptized, from which, as catechumens were debarred, so others might not withdraw themselves under pain of ecclesiastical censure.

This was the true order of the first and second service in the ancient Church, and the true distinction between the *missa catechumenorum* and *missa fidelium*, of which I intend to give a full account in the two next Books[19].

The true original and meaning of

4. At present we may observe how shamefully they have abused the ancient name *missa* under the appellation of *mass*,

γνησίως μεταμέλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκροωμένοις ποιήσουσι καὶ ἕπτα ἔτη ὑποπεσοῦνται· δύο δὲ ἔτη, χωρὶς προσφορᾶς, κοινωνήσουσι τῶν εὐχῶν.

[17] C. 24. (t. 1. p. 1464 d.) *Οἱ καταμαντευόμενοι, καὶ ταῖς συνηθείαις τῶν χρόνων ἐξακολουθοῦντες, ἢ εἰσάγοντές τινας εἰς τοὺς ἑαυτῶν οἴκους ἐπὶ ἀνευρέσει φαρμακειῶν, ἢ καὶ καθάρσει, ὑπὸ τὸν κανόνα πιπτέτωσαν τῆς πενταετίας κατὰ τοὺς βαθμοὺς ὡρισμένους, τρία ἔτη ὑποπτώσεως, καὶ δύο ἔτη εὐχῆς χωρὶς προσφορᾶς.*

[18] C. 2. (t. 2. p. 561 d.) *Πάντας τὰς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν [τοῦ Θεοῦ] καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφομένους τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατά τινα ἀταξίαν, τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

[19] [Which formed the sixth volume of the original publication in 1719, and now constitute the fifth of this improved edition. Ed.]

the ancient name, *missa, the mass,* which in its primitive use denotes every part of divine service: but nowhere an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead.

who apply it only to denote the office of consecrating bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and offering that as an expiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead. For anciently the name *missa* signified no such thing, but was a general name for every part of divine service. It signified, as we have seen already, the service of the catechumens, as well as the service of the altar; and is often used for the psalmody, for the lessons, and for the prayers at evening, when there was no communion, as well as for the prayers used in time of celebration of the eucharist. Thus Cassian [19] often mentions the *missa nocturna*, by which he means *the morning prayers and psalmody before day*, when it is certain they had no communion. The Council of Agde [20] speaks of *evening mass*, as well as *morning*, which meant no more but morning and evening prayer without any communion. For they had no communion either morning or evening at their daily prayers, but only on festivals at a distinct hour from both of those. So the Emperor Leo, in his Tactics [21], speaks of the μίσαι [22] ἑσπεριναὶ, a word plainly borrowed from the Latin *missa*, for the Greeks had originally no such name to signify only evening prayer. And Bishop Usher, in his Religion of the Ancient Irish [23], gives us another such instance out of Adamnanus [24], who uses the name *vespertinalis missa* for what is commonly

[19] Instit. l. 2. c. 13. (p. 25. Vid. Titul.,—Quare post missam nocturnam dormire non oporteat.—L. 3. c. 5. (p. 39.) Quod Ægypti ne incurrant, equidem, cum soleant certis temporibus etiam ante gallorum cantum consurgere, missa canonica celebrata, usque ad lucem post hæc vigilias extendunt.

[20] C. 30. (t. 4. p. 1388 b.) . . . . In conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos, capitella de psalmis dici [al. dicantur], &c.

[21] C. 11. n. 18., cited by Bishop Usher, (Works, v. 4. p. 277.) See n. 23, following.

[22] [We have also and more correctly μίσσαι. Μίνσαι is likewise found. See Du Fresne, Glossar. Græcitat. Lugdun. 1688. (t. 1. p. 938.) Constantinus in Tacticis, p. 50. Ἀφ' ἧς δοθῶσιν αἱ μίνσαι τὴν ἑσπέραν, ἕως οὗ πάλιν δοθῇ τὸ σημεῖον. Ita in MS. legi monet Meursius. Hinc μισσεύειν vel μησσεύειν, *dimittere, &c.*—See also Du Fresne, Glossar. Latinit., on the word, *missa*, in its third meaning for *missio* or *dimissio*, and in its fourth, or Romish sense, for *incruentum Christianorum sacrificium, in quo Christi corpus conficitur, &c.* Ed.]

[23] Ch. 4. p. 26. ex Adamnan. Vit. Columban. l. 3. c. 31. (ibid. p. 276.) So the last Mass that St. Colme was ever present at is noted by Adamnanus to have been *vespertinalis Dominicæ noctis missa.*

[24] [Libri Tres de S. Columba. Vid. ap. Canisii Thesaur. Monument. &c. Antverp. 1625. t. 1. pp. 680, seqq.—I have not found the precise words to which the Author refers through Usher. Ed.]

called *evening prayer.* And the late learned Mabillon[23] has observed out of the Rules of Cæsarius Arelatensis and Aurelian, that the word *missa* is sometimes used for *the lessons* also. For it is one of Aurelian's rules, 'that they should take six *missas*, that is *lessons, out of the prophet Isaiah. Facite sex missas de Esai propheta.*' And Mabillon[24] very judiciously remarks further, that the word *missa* has at least three significations. It sometimes signifies *the lessons*, sometimes *the collects* or *prayers*, and sometimes *the dismission of the people.* And indeed the third sense is the original notation of the word; for *missa* is the same as *missio.* And it was the form used in the Latin Church, *Ite, missa est!* which answers to the Greek Ἀπολύεσθε and Προέλθετε,—the solemn words used at the dismission of the catechumens first, and then of the whole assembly afterwards, at the end of their respective services. Whence the services themselves at last took their names from these solemn dismissions, the one being called *missa catechumenorum*, and the other *missa fidelium*, neither of which ever signify more than *the divine service*, at which the one or the other attended.

In vain therefore do many learned men labour to deduce its original from foreign languages, to make it signify something agreeable to the modern notion of the Roman Mass, when it is so plainly of Latin extraction. Baronius[25], after Reuclin and

[23] De Liturg. Gallic. l. 2. (p. 107, in notis.) Totidem lectiones præscribit Aurelianus ..... in Regula sua .... Dicite unum *nocturnum* et facite sex missas, *id est lectiones*, de Isaia propheta. [Conf. Disquisit. de Cursu Gallic. c. 2. s. 34. (ibid. p. 406.) ..... Ambo (Cæsarius et Aurelianus) duos tantum *nocturnos* passim in vigiliis assignant et lectiones uterque *missas* appellant. Ed.]

[24] Ibid. Disquisit. c. 1. s. 17. (p. 393.) Hoc vocabulum aliquando lectionem, aliquando vero collectam seu orationem, nonnunquam dismissionem significat.

[25] An. 34. n. 59. (t. 1. p. 160 c.) .... Cum multa sint hujus sacrificii nomina, illud est antiquissimum, et apud Latinos usitatius atque frequentius, *Missa;* quod quidem (sicut et Christiana fides profitetur) ex Hebraica vel Chaldaica nomenclatura acceptum esse videtur. Quod enim in nostra Vulgata legitur, *spontanea oblatio,* [Deut. 16.] Hebraice et Chaldaice dicitur, *missah,* quam offerebant Domino, in gratiarum actionem de fructibus terræ, qua et vescebantur in templo cum recordatione præteritæ servitutis, et ab eadem liberationis. Quæ quidem omnia cum optime conveniant prædicto a Christo instituto sacrificio; eo potius majores nostri usi sunt nomine, quam cujuspiam alterius sacrificii: nam et ea potissimum ratione ab illis id factum esse videtur, quod spontanea recolatur prima illa sui ipsius a Domino nostro Jesu Christo facta oblatio, &c. [John Reuclin or

Genebrard, would have it come from the Hebrew word *missah, an oblation;* but Durantus[26] has a good reason against that; because, if it had been of Hebrew extraction, the Greeks would have retained it in their language, as they do the words *Hosanna, Sabaoth, Allelujah,* and *Amen:* whereas there is no Greek writer uses it till the time of Leo Sapiens, who first borrows it from the Latin, in his Tactics. Albaspinæus has still a wilder conjecture; he says[27], the word *mess,* among the northern nations, signifies *a festival,* and therefore he imagines the name *missa* and *mass* might come from that: which is only to invert the origination, and make the daughter to become the mother; since it is evident, the name *mess* comes from *missa,* and not *missa* from that. Cardinal Bona[28] takes

Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnio, an eminent scholar and reformer, was professor of Greek and Hebrew at Wittembergh in 1518 and afterwards at Ingolstadt and Tubingen. He died at Stutgard in 1522, aged 72. His writings, *De Arte Cabalistica* and *De Verbo Mirifico,* each in three books, are exstant *ad calcem Petr. Galatini de Arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis, &c. Basil.* 1561. *fol.*—Gilbert Genebrard was a celebrated Benedictine of the Order of Cluny. Born at Riom in Auvergne, 1537. Professor of Hebrew at Navarre. Archbishop of Aix 1593. Died 1597. His *Isagoge Rabbinica et Tabulæ Rabbinicæ* forms the first article in Reland's Analecta Rabbinica, &c. Traject. 1723. 8vo.—For both the above see Darling's Cyclopædia Bibliographica, Lond. 1854. Ed.]

[26] De Rit. Eccles. l. 2. c. 1. n. 1. (p. 98.) Quod si missæ nomen Hebraicum esset, a Christianis ab Hebræis retentum, Græci patres, a quibus Sabaoth, Alleluia, Hosanna, Amen, aliaque Hebraicorum vocabula ad nos transmissa sunt, nominis *missæ* meminissent: at nemo Græcorum patrum ea voce usus est. —So also Bellarmin and Bona both refute him.

[27] [De l'Eucharistie, l. 2. ch. 3. (ad calc. Optat. p. 236 d, e.) . . . . . Il est constant, que le mot de Mess, est un mot du Nord; car encore aujourd'huy il est en usage parmy ces nations. Il est aussi constant qu'anciennement parmy ces mesmes peuples il signifioit une assemblée, une feste, et un sacrifice par consequent; car les barbares ny les payens n'ont jamais eu de festes sans sacrifice, et l'essence d'une feste parmy eux estoit le sacrifice. . . . . Or si du temps de ces Capitulaires [de Charlemagne] ce mot estoit en usage, pour signifier une feste et une terme des choses civiles, faut croire, qu'il avoit la mesme signification aux siècles précédentes; et que lorsque la religion a esté establie au nord, qu'ils appelloient leurs festes *Mess.* Et partant je concluds qu'on a baillé ce mesme nom au sacrifice de la Messe, lors qu'il a esté estably parmy ces peuples, à cause qu'il est une feste, un sacrifice; et que pour le célébrer, il faut faire une assemblée, qui sont les significations, qu'on trouve que ce mot avoit parmy eux. *Grischov.*]

[28] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 1. n. 6. (p. 176.) where he censures Genebrard as *nimis addictus rebus Hebraicis.* Alii denique, quorum non ambigimus verissimam esse sententiam, a missione seu dimissione populi, missæ nomen ortum esse asseverant, ita ut missa idem sit ac missio populi et licentia discedendi. Audiendus primo loco Avitus Viennensis archiepiscopus, qui circa finem quinti

a great deal of pains to confute these and all other false opinions, and establishes the true one with undeniable evidence from Alcimus Avitus, and all the ancient ritualists, Isidore, Rabanus Maurus, Florus Magister, Remigius, Antissiodorensis, Alcuinus, Gregory's Sacramentarium, Hugo Victorinus, and Bernoldus, who all agree in this, that *missa* comes from the *dismission* of the people, and not from any other original. So that I think it needless to trouble my reader with any of these authorities, since the matter is now cleared beyond all contradiction by Mabillon and Bona, two such eminent writers of the Roman communion.

In what sense divine service

5. Another general name of the ancient service, which in later ages has met with some abuse, is *sacrificium, sacrifice;*

sæculi et initio sexti floruit. Is Epist. 1. ad Gundobadum Burgundionum regem, *Non missum facitis,* inquit, *nihil est aliud quam non dimittitis. A cujus proprietate sermonis in ecclesiis palatiisque, sive prætoriis missa fieri pronuntiatur, cum populus ab observatione dimittitur. Nam genus hoc nominis etiam in sæcularis auctoribus, nisi memoriam vestram per occupationes lectio desueta subterfugit, invenietis.* Hæc Avitus, qui non exprimit sæculares auctores, apud quos nomen missæ hoc sensu reperitur. Mihi vero occurrunt, Cicero, qui in fine Philipp. 5. placere dixit, *Legiones bello confecto missas fieri:* et Suetonius, in Caligula, c. 25., ubi agens de Lollia Paulina, quam in uxorem duxerat, *Brevi,* ait, *missam fecit,* hoc est, dimisit. Porro verbis Aviti nihil efficacius ad supra memoratos scriptores redarguendos, qui missæ nomen exoticum fingunt, et aliunde derivant. Missio autem in veteri ecclesia duplex erat: una post evangelium et sermonem, quando catechumeni, infideles, pœnitentes, et alii, quibus vetitum erat sacramentorum participationi interesse, a diacono dimittebantur hac voce, *Si quis est catechumenus, exeat foras:* vel ut dicit Gregorius, Lib. 2. Dialog. c. 23., *Si quis non communicat, det locum:* et hæc dicebatur *missa,* seu *missio* catechumenorum. . . . . Altera erat initiatorum, cum, re divina peracta, eos diaconus dimittebat dicens, *Ite, missa est:* et hæc missa fidelium vocabatur. Isidorus, Lib. 6. Originum, c. 19.; Missa tempore sacrificii est, quando catechumeni foras mittuntur, clamante Levita, Si quis catechumenus remansit, exeat foras: et inde missa. Subscribit Isidorum iisdem verbis Rabanus Maurus, Libro. de Institut. Clericorum, c. 42. Florus Magister, et Remigius Antissiodorensis in fine expositionis missæ, *Missa,* inquiunt, *nihil aliud intelligitur, quam dimissio, id est, absolutio, quam, celebratis omnibus, tunc diaconus esse pronuntiat, cum populus a solemni observatione dimittitur:* quæ verba transcripserunt a Sancto Gregorio in Libro Sacramentorum feria sexta Parasceues: *Deinde communicat ipse, et omnis clerus, et fiunt missæ:* . . . . Hugo Victorinus, Lib. 2. de Eccles. Officiis, c. 41.; *Dicit diaconus, Ite, missa est, quasi revertimini ad propria. Ab hac missione, id est, dimissione, missam dicunt appellari.* Bernoldus Presbyter Constantiensis, in Expositione Ordinis Romani apud Cassandrum in Liturgicis, c. 26.; *Missam ideo appellari dicimus, quia lecto evangelio foras mittuntur ex pronuntiatione diaconi, qui minime offerendo vel communicando non poterant interesse sacramentis divini mysterii.*

anciently called *sacrificium.*

a name borrowed from the Jewish carnal sacrifices, and applied to the spiritual sacrifices of Christians, viz. their prayers and praises, and preaching, and devoting themselves entirely, body and soul, to the service of Christ, by the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. Hence every part of divine worship had the name of *sacrifice*, and not only the service of the altar. For they commonly call their evening hymns and prayers by the name of *evening sacrifice.* Thus St. Jerom bids Læta[29] 'accustom her daughter not only to the morning hymns, and daily hours of prayer, the third, the sixth, and the ninth, but also when night comes, and the lamps are lighted, then in like manner to render to God her evening sacrifice.' And so St. Hilary[30], upon those words of the Psalmist, "Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice," says, 'The sacrifice of Christians is their prayers recommended to God by stretching forth their hands to relieve the poor. For we,' says he, 'upon whom the ends of the world are come, do not sacrifice to God with blood or burnt-offerings: but the evening sacrifice, which is pleasing to God, is that which Christ teaches in his Gospel, "I was an hungry, and ye fed me; thirsty, and ye gave me drink, &c." This is the evening sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of the last times. In this we are to lift up our hands: for by such prayers the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven is prepared for those that are blessed of God from the foundation of the world.' In the same sense Eusebius[31] calls the prayers of Christians, 'the rational sacrifices, that are offered without blood to God.' And Clemens Alexandrinus[32] says 'The sacrifices of Christians are their prayers and praises, and reading of the Scriptures, and psalms and hymns before

[29] Ep. 7. [al. 107.] (t. 1. p. 680.) .... Accensaque lucernula reddere sacrificium vespertinum.

[30] In Ps. 140. p. 330. (t. 1. p. 593 e. n. 4.) Non enim sanguine et holocaustis nos, in quos consummatio sæculorum devenit, sacrificamus Deo: sed quod sacrificium vespertinum placitum sit, audiamus Dominum in evangeliis dicentem, *Venite, etc.* Hoc sacrificium vespertinum, id est, temporum novissimorum est. In hoc manus elevandæ sunt: quis istiusmodi orationibus jam ab initio mundi benedictis Dei regni cœlestis præparata possessio est.

[31] De Laud. Constant. (v. 1. p. 768. 45.) Ἀναίμους δὲ καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας, τὰς δι' εὐχῶν.—De Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 45. (ibid. p. 651. 40.) .... Θυσίαις ἀναίμοις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἱερουργίαις τὸ Θεῖον ἱλάσκοντο.

[32] Stromat. 7. (p. 860. 47.) Αὐτίκα θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ εὐχαί τε καὶ αἶνοι, καὶ αἱ πρὸ τῆς ἑστιάσεως ἐντεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν· ψαλμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὕμνοι παρὰ τὴν ἑστίασιν, πρό τε τῆς κοίτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ εὐχαὶ πάλιν.

meals, and at their meals, and at bed-time, and in the night.' And there are hundreds of passages in the Ancients [33], both of public and private prayers, to the same purpose, besides what is said of the sacrifice of the eucharist, or communion-service, of which we shall have reason to say something more upon another occasion. Here it is sufficient to have hinted the grounds, upon which the Ancients gave the general name of *sacrifice* to all parts of divine service.

And *sacramenta.*

6. Another name, though neither so ancient nor so common as the former, is that of *sacramenta*, which in some authors signifies not what we now call sacraments, but *the order* or *manner of performing divine offices*, and that as well the prayers and service in general, as the particular offices of administering baptism and the Lord's supper. For the word *sacramentum*, answering to the Greek μυστήριον, is a word of a large extent, denoting not only the proper sacraments, but *all sacred ceremonies* and *usages* of the Church that have any thing of symbolical or spiritual significancy in them, representing something more to the understanding than appears to the outward senses: and in a more restrained, though not the strictest sense, it denotes *the manner* or *method of performing divine offices* in the Church, whether relating to the sacraments, properly so called, or any other parts of divine service, as the prayers, hymns, lessons, in morning or evening service. In this sense, it is observed by learned men [34], that the Book of Divine Offices composed by Gregory the Great for the use

[33] Vid. Cassian. Instit. l. 3. c. 3. (p. 32.) De vespertinis autem sacrificiis quid dicendum est, quæ jugiter offerri etiam in Veteri Testamento et Lege Mosaica sanciuntur? &c.—C. Aurelian. 3. c. 29. (t. 5. p. 302 e.) De missis nullus laicorum ante discedat, quam dominica dicatur oratio: et si episcopus præsens fuerit, ejus benedictio exspectetur. Sacrificia vero matutina missarum, sive vespertina, ne quis cum armis, pertinentibus ad bellorum usum, spectet, &c.—Martin. Bracarens. c. 66. [al. 63.] (CC. ibid. p. 912 d.) Si quis presbyter, vel diaconus, vel quilibet clericus ecclesiæ deputatus, si intra civitatem fuerit, aut in quolibet loco, in quo ecclesia est; et ad quotidianum psallendi sacrificium, matutinis vel vespertinis horis, ad ecclesiam non convenerit; deponatur a clero.

[34] Menardus, Not. in Sacramentar. Greg. p. 1. (ap. Oper. Greg. M. t. 3. part. 1. p. 274 a.) Quare non assentior iis, qui scribunt, titulum hujus libri esse Τὸ *Sacramentarium*, non vero *Liber Sacramentorum*. Cum etiam contrarium pateat ex hoc sacramentorum libro, in quo manifeste *sacramentarium* a *libro sacramentorum* distinguitur, &c.—Stillingfleet, Origin. Britann. ch. 4. p. 225. (v. 3. p. 139.) As to the Communion-service, &c.

of the Roman Church, bears the title of *Liber Sacramentorum, the Book of Sacraments,* that is, a book or method for performing divine offices in the Church. And Gelasius did the same thing before him, under the title of *Codex Sacramentarius*[34], lately published by Thomasius, at Rome, 1680. And Gennadius[35] says Musæus, a presbyter of Marseilles, composed *volumen sacramentorum, a large book of sacraments,* that is, *divine offices,* to direct what lessons, and psalms, and hymns were to be used in the communion-service, according to the seasons of the year, and what prayers and thanksgiving were to make up the service of the Church. And it is the opinion of two very learned men, Menardus[36] and Bishop Stillingfleet[37], that both St. Austin and St. Ambrose give the name of *sacramenta* to the *books of liturgic offices* used in their time. And they observe, that the old Missal published by Illyricus bears the name of *Ordo Sacramentorum,* which can mean nothing but the manner of performing divine offices in the administration of the eucharist and other parts of public worship.

And *cursus ecclesiasticus.*

7. These offices are by other writers styled *cursus ecclesiasticus, the order or course of divine offices.* For under this title Gregory Turonensis is said to have composed a book, *De Cursibus Ecclesiasticis,* for the use of the Gallican Church,

[34] [Also in v. 1. p. 485. of Muratori's Liturgia Romana Vetus, &c., Venet. 1748., where it is entitled, *Sacramentarium Gelasianum, sive Liber Sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ, a S. Gelasio I. Papa, uti videtur, concinnatus.* For the Sacramentaries of Leo and of Gregory, the Missale Gothorum and the Gallicanum Vetus, as well as the First and Second Ordo Romanus, and some other ancient offices, see the same collection of Liturgica. Ed.]

[35] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 79. (ap. Oper. Hieron. t. 2. p. 981.)...Composuit sacramentorum egregium et non parvum volumen, per membra quidem pro opportunitate officiorum et temporum, pro lectionum textu, psalmorumque serie et decantatione discretum, &c.—C. 78. de Voconio, (ibid. p. 981.) Composuit sacramentorum egregium volumen.

[36] Ut supra, (ibid. b. 5.) Aptissime autem hoc opus *Liber Sacramentorum* dicitur, quia in eo officia missarum liturgica recte disposita continentur; quæ sancti patres olim *sacramenta* appellarunt.—S. Ambrosius, l. 3. de Virginibus: *An quid est indignius, quam oracula divina circumstrepi, ne audiantur, ne credantur, ne revelentur? circumsonare sacramenta confusis vocibus, ut impediatur oratio pro salute depromta omnium?*—S. Augustinus, Ep. 59. [al. 149.] ad Paulinum: *Ut precationes accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in Domini mensa, incipiat benedici.*—Et lib. de Dono Perseverantiæ, c. 13. *Quod ergo in sacramentis fidelium dicitur, ut sursum cor habeamus ad Dominum, munus est Domini.*

[37] See s. 6. n. 34. p. 273.

which is now lost: but he himself[38] mentions it in his history. And Bishop Usher[39] cites an ancient manuscript out of the Cotton Library, which says, 'that Germanus and Lupus brought *ordinem cursus Gallorum, the Gallican liturgy*, into Britain with them.' And this was the liturgy of the British Churches for some ages, till by degrees the *Cursus Romanus* was brought in upon them. Bede[40] says, 'In the time of Pope Agatho, Johannes Abbas, the Roman præcentor, was sent over to settle the Roman *cursus*, (or *psalmody*,) for the whole year, according to the usage and way of St. Peter's Church at Rome.' And the Council of Calchuth[41] sometime after Bede speaks of the liturgy under the same title, ordering 'all Churches at the canonical hours reverently to perform their *cursus*.' And Mabillon[42] cites the Lives of Walaricus and Senericus, where there is frequent mention of the *Cursus Gallicanus*.

The names λειτουργία, ἱερουργία, ἱερὰ, and μυσταγωγία, most usual in the Greek Church.

8. Among the Greek writers we seldom meet with any of these names, but they usually style all holy offices, and all parts of divine service, by the general name of λειτουργία, and ἱερουργία, *liturgy*, and *sacred service*. Though *liturgy*, in its extended sense, denotes any public office or ministration, as the

[38] Hist. Francor. l. 10. c. ult. (p. 538 c. 9.).... De Cursibus Ecclesiasticis unum librum condidi.

[39] De Primord. Eccles. p. 185. sive Antiquit. Britann. c. 11. (Works, v. 5. p. 394.) In anonymo [MS. in Bibliotheca Cottoniana] de ecclesiasticorum officiorum origine, noningentis abhinc annis scripto libello, Germanum et Lupum ordinem cursus Gallorum, sive Gallicanam liturgiam, a Ioanne Cassiano et Lirinensis cœnobii patribus acceptum, in Britanniam induxisse legimus: 'Beatissimus Cassianus,' inquit author, 'qui Lirinensi monasterio beatum Honoratum habuit comparem, et post ipsum beatus Honoratus primus abba et sanctus Cæsarius episcopus, qui fuit in Arelate, et beatus Porcarius abba, qui in ipso monasterio fuit, ipsum cursum decantaverunt. Qui beatum Lupum et beatum Germanum monachos in eorum monasterio habuerunt: et ipsi sub normam regulæ ipsum cursum ibidem decantaverunt. Et postea in Lirinensi episcopatu cathedram [al. episcopatus cathedra] summi honoris, pro reverentia sanctitatis eorum, sunt adepti: et postea in Britanniis vel Scotiis prædicaverunt, quæ Vita beati Germani episcopi Antissiodorensis et Vita beati Lupi affirmat.

[40] Hist. l. 4. c. 18. (p. 161. 30.) Accepit et præfatum Johannem Abbatem Britanniam perducendum, quatenus in monasterio suo cursum canendi annuum, sicut ad Sanctum Petrum Romæ agebatur, edoceret. Egitque Abba Johannes, ut jussionem acceperat Pontificis, et ordinem videlicet, ritumque canendi ac legendi viva voce præfati monasterii cantores edocendo, &c.

[41] C. 7. (t. 6. p. 1865 b.) Ut omnes ecclesiæ publicæ canonicis horis cursum suum cum reverentia habeant.

[42] De Cursu Gallicano, s. 5. n. 51. (pp. 419, 420.) Neque vero solum, &c.

Apostle uses it, Phil. 2, 30, and 2 Cor. 9, 12, for the ministration of charity; and ecclesiastical writers do the same, often applying it both to civil and sacred functions, as to the office of a magistrate or a bishop, as Casaubon[43] shows at large; yet in a more limited sense it is put to signify those sacred offices which make up the several parts of divine worship, as prayers, reading, preaching, and administration of the sacraments. But it is never used as the Romanists would appropriate it, for the business of sacrificing only. The Council of Ephesus[44] speaks both of 'evening and morning liturgies,' which doubtless mean evening and morning prayers only. And so Casaubon[45] observes, that Justinian takes it for the office of reading the Scripture, as well as administering the eucharist, when he says of a certain monastery, 'that the divine liturgy was performed in it, as it was used to be in the churches, both by reading the Holy Scriptures, and receiving the holy communion.' And Antiochus[46] applies the name of *liturgy* not only to morning prayer, but also to the service of their midnight assemblies. Neither of which was in his time the ordinary hours of the communion-service. So that Erasmus[47] and others are governed more by prejudice than reason, who would have that passage of Acts 13, 2, λειτουργούντων αὐτῶν, to be rendered *sacrificantibus illis*, as if there were no divine service without sacrifice in their notion of it; when yet the Vulgar Translation renders it *ministering*, and the old Syriac and Arabic, as Beza[48] observes, have it *praying;*

[43] Exercit. in Baron. 16. n. 41. p. 471. (p. 382. col. 2. et seqq.) Λειτουργεῖν primo natione [leg. prima notione] est opus facere publicum vel publice, &c.

[44] Ep. Synod. ad Imperat. ap. Casaubon. ibid. (p. 384. col. 1.) .... Ἐπιτελέσαι ... τὰς ἑσπερινὰς ἢ τὰς ἑωθινὰς λειτουργίας.

[45] Ibid. (p. 384. col. 1.) Itaque Justinianus, Novella septima, ἱερὰν λειτουργίαν describens, duas illius partes commemorat, recitationem [scripturarum et administrationem] sacrosanctæ cœnæ Domini: Ἐν οἷς, inquit, ἱερὰ γέγονε λειτουργία τῶν τε θείων ἀναγινωσκομένων γραφῶν, τῆς τε ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀπορρήτου μεταδιδομένης κοινωνίας. [In the Francfort edition of 1615 the words bracketed are not found. Ed.]

[46] Hom. 19. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. (t. 1. p. 1056 b. 7.).... Καὶ ἐξέγειρον ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὰς νυκτερινὰς καὶ ἑωθινὰς λειτουργίας.

[47] [According to his version (Oper. t. 6. p. 484.) Quum autem illi sacrificarent Domino, &c.

[48] Nov. Test. (Cantabr. 1642. p. 333.) Illis autem sacram suam functionem obeuntibus, &c.—Conf. ibid. n. in loc. (2.) Syrus autem et Arabs, προσευχομένων, *precantibus;* nam λειτουργεῖν restrinxerunt ad publicas preces propter adjunctam jejunii mentionem. Ed.]

which is agreeable to the notion of *liturgy* for divine service. Yet when the epithet of *mystica* was added to *liturgia,* then it commonly signified *the communion-service.* As when Theodoret[49] says, 'that the salutation of St. Paul, (2 Cor. 13, 14.) "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.," is the beginning of the mystical liturgy,' he means the communion-office, where this form of salutation was always used. And so in the Clementina Epitome[50], 'the sacred liturgy' denotes the service of the altar, which came after the *εὐχὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ὕμνων, prayers used in psalmody,* or the service of the catechumens. And it is Bona's observation[51], out of Vincentius Riccardus[52], 'that except the words *sacred,* or *mystical,* be added to the name liturgy, it is never to be taken for the sacrifice of the altar, but for some other part of divine service.' Though, I think, this is more than can be fairly proved.

As on the other hand, when the epithet of *mystical* is added, it does not always, but only for the most part, as I said before, mean the eucharistical service. For the service of baptism was ever esteemed a mystical service, as well as that of the eucharist, and the name *μυσταγωγία, communion in the sacred mysteries,* is upon that account frequently given by St. Chrysostom[53], Theodoret[54], and others, to baptism, as well as the Lord's supper; as may be seen at large in Suicerus's collections[55] upon that subject. It is certain the author under

[49] Ep. 146. p. 1032. (t. 4. part. 2. p. 1260.) Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς μυστικῆς ἐστὶ λειτουργίας προοίμιον.

[50] De Gest. Petr. n. 155. (ap. Cot. 1. p. 796.).... Τοῦ πατριάρχου τὴν ἱερὰν ἐκτελέσαντος λειτουργίαν.

[51] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 3. n. 3. (p. 180.) Observat tamen vir eruditus Vincentius Riccardus in Comment. ad Proclum de Traditione Missæ, quod quando patres vocem liturgiæ pro sacrificio usurpant, semper epitheton *sacræ,* vel *mysticæ* adjungant.

[52] Comment. in Proclum. de Tradit. Missæ. (p. 584.)... Cum eo nomine in hac significatione utuntur patres, fere semper cum adjuncto efferant *μυστικῆς* vel *ἱερᾶς.*

[53] Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 272. [juxt. Ed. Bened. Catech. ad Illuminand. 2.] (t. 2. p. 242 c.) Ἂν ἀναμνησθῇς τῆς φωνῆς ἐκείνης, ἣν ἀφῆκας μυσταγωγουμένη, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, κ.τ.λ.—[Hom. 1. in Act. p. 615. (t. 9. p. 13 d.).... Πολλὰ τῆς δωρεᾶς ταύτης ἀνάξια γίνεται· δέον γὰρ εὐφραίνεσθαι, καὶ χορεύειν, καὶ χαίρειν, καὶ στεφανοῦσθαι, ἑτέρου μυσταγωγουμένου. *Grischov*]

[54] In Cantic. c. 1. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 30.)... Τῆς ἱερᾶς μυσταγωγίας, ἐν ᾗ οἱ τελούμενοι μετὰ τὴν ἄρνησιν τοῦ τυράννου καὶ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ὁμολογίαν, οἱονεί τινα σφραγῖδα βασιλικὴν δέχονται τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μύρου τὸ χρίσμα.

[55] Thes. Eccles. voce, Μυσταγωγία. (t. 2. p. 380.) [After quoting the previously cited passages from Chrysostom and Theodoret, he adds the

the name of Dionysius the Areopagite uses the title of *mystagogia*, as well when he is describing the ceremonies and service of baptism, as the eucharist: and Cyril's Mystagogical Catechisms are equally an exposition of the rites observed in administering baptism and confirmation, as of those of the other sacrament; these being the two great mystical services of the Christian Church.

The names ἱερὰ, ἱερουργία, and θυσία, are all words of the same importance: they most commonly signify the communion service, or the sacrifice of prayers at the altar. But sometimes they denote the offices of baptism, preaching, reading the Scripture, and psalmody: these being the spiritual sacrifices of Christians. It is certain the Apostle calls preaching the Gospel by the name of ἱερουργία, (Rom. 15, 16.) and the conversion of the Gentiles thereby, *the offering them up* or *sacrificing them to God.* Upon which words Chrysostom[53] observes, 'that the Apostle does not call this service barely λατρεία, but λειτουργία and ἱερουργία, *sacrifice*, or *sacred service.* For this is my priesthood, to preach and publish the Gospel: this the sacrifice that I offer to God.' And St. Basil[54] gives the same names of ἱερουργία and θυσία to the duty of praise and thanksgiving: 'I will offer unto thee the sacrifice of praise.' And we have seen before, in the fifth section, how the evening prayer is commonly styled *sacrificium vespertinum, evening sacrifice*, by the Latin writers.

Liturgy sometimes taken for set forms of prayer.

9. It is further to be observed, that as the Latins by the names *missa, cursus, ordo*, and *officium*, mean not only *the divine worship itself*, but also *the books containing the method and prescriptions for the regular performance of it*, which we usually call *set forms of prayer:* so the Greeks sometimes understand the same thing by the name of *liturgy*, and that not only

following *illustrem locum*, as he terms it, from Severiani Hom. 5. de Creatione. (int. Oper. Chrysost. Ed. Bened. t. 6. p. 482 c.) Πῶς βαπτιζόμεθα; ἐν ὀνόματι Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ποία μείζων ἡ ἀναγέννησις, ἢ τῆς δημιουργίας, ἢ ἡ τῆς μυσταγωγίας; Ἐκεῖ ἀρχὴ ζωῆς εἰς θάνατον· ὧδε ἀρχὴ θανάτου εἰς ζωήν. Ed.]

[53] Hom. 29. in Rom. p. 302. (t. 9. p. 731 a.) .... Οὐχ ἁπλῶς λατρείαν λέγων, καθάπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἀλλὰ λειτουργίαν, καὶ ἱερουργίαν. Αὕτη γάρ μοι ἱερωσύνη, τὸ κηρύττειν καὶ καταγγέλλειν· ταύτην προσφέρω τὴν θυσίαν.

[54] In Ps. 115. p. 275. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 531 e. n. 5.) Ἱερουργήσω σοι τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως θυσίαν.

when they speak of the forms of administering the sacraments, but of any other parts of divine service.

It is plain the author of the Constitutions[55] takes the word in this sense, when he applies it to the forms of prayer then made for the catechumens. And Casaubon[56] observes, that all those forms of worship which go under the names of Peter, James, Andrew, Chrysostom, and Basil, bear the name of *liturgies,* which the Latins call *ordo* and *officium,* and the modern Greeks ἀκολουθία. These were sometimes also among the ancient Greek writers termed εὐχῶν διατάξεις, *the order of the prayers;* which is the name that Nazianzen[57] gives the Liturgy of St. Basil, composed by him by the direction of his bishop, whilst he was presbyter of Cæsarea, and those forms and orders of divine worship, collected by the author of the Constitutions, bear the same title of διατάξεις. In Chrysostom they are styled νόμοι, *the rules* or *appointments* of the Church; and the prayers particularly are distinguished into two sorts of forms, both by him[58] and the Council of Laodicea[59], the one called εὐχαὶ κατηχουμένων, *the prayers of the catechumens,* and the other εἰχαὶ πιστῶν, *the prayers of the faithful,* or *believers.*

But I shall say no more of liturgies here, considered as set forms or prescriptions of worship, because they will come to be discoursed of more fully hereafter in their proper place.

Of litanies. This at first a general name for prayers. How and when it came to be appropriated to certain parti-

10. There is one general name more, which the first writers use to denote all sorts of public prayers, but the middle ages have appropriated it to a particular form of worship, that is, *litanies,* in Greek called λιτανεῖαι and λιταὶ, in Latin *supplicationes* and *rogationes.* These words in their original signification are but another name for *prayers in general,* of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church, or by any

[55] L. 8. c. 6. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 393.) Ἡ θεία λειτουργία, ἐν ᾗ προσφώνησις ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων.

[56] Exercit. 16. in Baron. n. 41. p. 472. (p. 384. col. 1.) Ab hac ratione dictæ sunt λειτουργίαι, descriptiones quædam ordinis servandi in sacris celebrandis: cujusmodi sunt, quæ hodie circumferuntur sub titulis, partim veris, partim falsis, Petri Jacobi, Andreæ, Basilii, Chrysostomi, et similes. Latini vocant *ordinem agendi* vel *officium.* Græci aliquando ἀκολουθίαν, et Balsamon non semel.

[57] Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 340 d.) Εὐχῶν διατάξεις καὶ εὐκοσμίαι τοῦ βήματος.

[58] Vid. Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. p. 740. (t. 10. p. 435 a.) Διά τοι τοῦτο, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς οὕτω γίνεσθαι κελεύουσιν οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας νόμοι, οὐ τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων.

[59] C. 19. See before, s. 3. n. 15, preceding.

cular forms of worship, called *rogations.*

private person. Eusebius[60], speaking of Constantine's custom of making his solemn addresses to God in his tent before he went out to battle, says 'he endeavoured to render God propitious to him by supplications and *litanies*, that he might obtain his favour, assistance, and direction in his enterprises.' And again[61] he says, 'a little before his death he spent some time in the house of prayer, making supplications and *litanies* to God.' In which places *litany* seems to be a general name, and not to intend any particular sort of prayers. So Chrysostom[62] also uses the word *litany*, when he says to his people, 'To-morrow I shall go forth with you to make our *litany*,' that is, the public service. And again[63], speaking of the solemn form of words, *Pax vobis! Peace be with you!* he says, 'the bishop used it in all offices; when he first entered the church, when he made the prayers and *litanies*, and when he preached.' And Arcadius, in one of his laws[64] made against heretics about the same time, takes *litany* in the same sense for prayers in general, when he forbids heretics 'to hold profane assemblies in the city, either by night or by day, to make their *litany*.' Where it is plain his intent was, not to prohibit heretics from making any particular sort of prayers, but all prayers in general within the city, and to cut off all opportunities of meeting either by night or by day for that purpose: and so Gothofred understands him: for this law was made with a direct view to the Arian assemblies for psalmody in their night stations, which had occasioned some tumults and murder in the city, as Socrates[65] and Sozomen[66] inform us. So that the morning hymns and psalmody and prayers then came all under the general name of *litany*, and the Arians were forbidden in this sense to make any litanies within the city by this law of Arcadius.

[60] Vit. Constant. l. 2. c. 14. (v. 1. p. 543. 14.)...Τὸν θεὸν ἱκετηρίαις καὶ λιταῖς ἱλεούμενος, κ. τ. λ.

[61] Ibid. l. 4. c. 61. (p. 660. 33.) ...Εὐκτηρίῳ ἐνδιατρίψας οἴκῳ, ἱκετηρίους εὐχάς τε καὶ λιτανείας ἀνέπεμπε τῷ Θεῷ.

[62] Hom. antequam iret in Exilium. t. 4. p. 965. (t. 3. p. 416 e.) Αὔριον εἰς λιτανεῖον ἐξελεύσομαι μεθ' ὑμῶν.

[63] Hom. 3. in Col. p. 1338. (t. 11. p. 347 d.) Ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις εἰρήνην, ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἐν ταῖς λιταῖς, ἐν ταῖς προσρήσεσι.

[64] Vid. Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 5. de Hæreticis, leg. 30. (t. 6. p. 149.) ... Interdicatur his omnibus, ad litaniam faciendam intra civitatem noctu vel interdiu profanis coire conventibus.

[65] L. 6. c. 8. (v. 2. pp. 321, 322.) Οἱ ἀρειανίζοντες, κ. τ. λ.

[66] L. 8. c. 8. (ibid. pp. 336, 337.) Ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείου αἱρέσεως, κ. τ. λ.

What Hamon Lestrange[67] alleges out of St. Austin, Cyprian, and Tertullian, proves nothing but that there were always prayers made in the church to implore God's mercy and favours; which no one ever denied: neither is the name *litany* used by any of them. It is more to the purpose what St. Basil[68] says to the Church of Neocæsarea, where Gregory Thaumaturgus was bishop; 'that though in Gregory's time they had no litanies, yet afterward before St. Basil's time they had admitted the use of them.' By which argument he defends the nocturnal prayers and psalmody and vigils against those who objected that they were not used in St. Gregory's time. For neither were litanies used in his time, and yet now they were in use, and no one objected novelty against them. This shows that St. Basil takes *litanies* for a peculiar sort of prayers, lately set up in the Church. For it cannot be doubted but that they had prayers before, though not of this particular kind.

Some think that litanies in this new limited sense were first introduced by Mamercus, bishop of Vienna, in France, about the year 450. But St. Basil's testimony proves them to be earlier in the East: and it is a mistake in those who assert Mamercus to be the first author of them in the West; for Sidonius Apollinaris, who lived in the time of Mamercus, and wrote some Epistles to him, says expressly that he was not the first inventor of them, but only of the rogation fast-days before Ascension, to which he applied the use of these litanies, which were in being long before, though not observed with such solemnity, nor fixed to any stated times, but only used, as exigencies required, to deprecate any impending judgment. This he declares at large in an Epistle to Mamercus himself[69],

[67] Alliance of Divine Offices, c. 4. p. 100. (Reprint. p. 144.) The *τὸ νῦν* and first moment, &c.

[68] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 450 d. n. 4.) *Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν, φησὶ, ταῦτα ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Γρεγορίου. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αἱ λιτανεῖαι, ἃς ὑμεῖς νῦν ἐπιτηδεύετε.*

[69] L. 7. Ep. 1. (p. 409.) Rumor est Gothos in Romanum solum castra movisse. Huic semper irruptioni nos, miseri Arverni, janua sumus. Namque odiis inimicorum hinc peculiaria fomenta subministramus, quia quod necdum terminos suos ab oceano in Rhodanum Ligeris alveo limitaverunt, solam (sub ope Christi) moram de nostra tantum obice patiuntur. Circumjectarum vero spatia, tractumque regionum, jam pridem regni minacis importuna devoravit impressio: sed animositati nostræ tam temerariæ tamque periculosæ non nos aut ambustam murorum faciem, aut putrem sudium cratem, aut propugnacula

styling him 'the author of the rogation-days,' and showing both the reasons of their institution, and the manner of observing them, with ardent supplications and fastings, in imitation of the Ninevites, to avert the threatening judgments of fire, or earthquakes, or inundations, or hostile invasions. But that we may not think Mamercus was the first author of litanies, because he applied their use particularly to the rogation days, he speaks more expressly in another Epistle[70], where he says, 'that Mamercus indeed first brought in the observation of the rogation solemnities, which spread by his example: but supplications or litanies were in use before, when men had occasion to pray against excessive rains or droughts; though they were observed but in a cold and disorderly manner, without fasting or full assemblies: but those which he instituted were observed with fasting, and praying, and singing, and weeping.'

What Sidonius says here proves that Mamercus was the author of the rogation-fast in France; but litanies were in use before: and if Savaro[71] judge right of one of St. Austin's homilies, the rogation-fast must have been observed long before

vigilum trita pectoribus confidimus opitulatura: solo tamen invectarum te auctore Rogationum palpamur auxilio, quibus inchoandis instituendisque populus Arvernus, etsi non effectu pari, affectu certe non impari cœpit initiari, et ob hoc circumfusis necdum dat terga terroribus. Non enim latet nostram sciscitationem, primis temporibus harumce supplicationum institutarum, civitas cœlitus tibi credita, per hujuscemodi prodigiorum terriculamenta vacuabatur. Nam modo scenæ mœnium publicorum crebris terræ motibus concutiebantur: nunc ignes sæpe flammati caducas culminum cristas superjecto favillarum monte tumulabant: nunc stupenda foro cubilia collocabat audacium pavenda mansuetudo cervorum: cum tu, inter ista discessu primorum populariumque statu urbis exinanito, ad nova celer veterum Ninivitarum exempla decurristi, ne divinæ admonitioni tua quoque desperatio conviciaretur, et vere jam de Deo tu minime poteras absque peccato post virtutum experimenta diffidere.

[70] L. 5. Ep. 14. (p. 352.) Rogationum nobis solennitatem primus Mamercus pater et pontifex, reverentissimo exemplo, utilissimo experimento, invenit, instituit, invexit. Erant quidem prius, (quod salva fidei pace sit dictum,) vagæ, tepentes, infrequentesque, utque sic dixerim, oscitabundæ supplicationes, quæ sæpe interpellantium prandiorum obicibus hebetabantur, maxime aut imbres aut serenitatem deprecaturæ: .... In his autem, quas suprafatus summus sacerdos nobis et protulit pariter et contulit, jejunatur, oratur, psallitur, fletur.

[71] Not. in Sidon. loc. citat. (p. 354.) Ex hoc loco notandum, ante ascensionem Domini ante Mamercum litanias fuisse, tot diebus, quot a Mamerco instituti sunt. D. Augustinus Serm. 173. in Vigilia Dominicæ ascensionis; quem consule. [Mamercus, or Mamertus. Ed.]

in the African Churches. For among his Homilies *De Tempore* there is one[72] upon the Vigil of the Ascension, where he speaks of a fast observed for three days before Ascension-day, advising all men to keep those days with fasting, prayer, and psalmody. However from the time of Mamercus we are sure these rogation-days and litanies were celebrated with great solemnity in the Church, being frequently mentioned by Alcimus Avitus[73], Cæsarius Arelatensis[74], Eucherius Lugdunensis Junior[75], and Gregory of Tours[76], to name no later writers. The first Council of Orleans, anno 511, established them by a decree[77], ordering the three days before Ascension to be kept a fast with abstinence after the manner of Lent, and with rogations or litanies, and that on these days servants should rest from their labours. In the Spanish Churches they deferred these rogations to the week after Pentecost: for they kept to the old rule of the ancient Church, not to have any fast during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide; therefore as Walafridus Strabo[78] observes of them, 'they would not observe the rogation-fast in the time that the Bridegroom was with them.' But by an order of the Council of Gironne[79] these litanies and this fast were put off to the week after Whitsun-

[72] Hom. 173. t. 10. p. 338. (t. 5. append. p. 299 f.) Sine dubio peccatorum suorum vulnera diligit, qui in istis tribus diebus, jejunando, orando, et psallendo, medicamenta sibi spiritualia non requirit.

[73] Hom. de Rogationibus. (ap. Galland. t. 10. p. 744 e. seqq.) Homilia de rogationibus, &c.

[74] Hom. 37. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 856 b. 13.) . . . . Tribus diebus, quos regulariter in toto mundo celebrat ecclesia.

[75] [Hom. de Litaniis. (ap. Bibl. Magn. Colon. Agripp. 1618. t. 5. part. 1. p. 568. sub nomine Eusebii Gallicani) Congruum et valde necessarium est, &c. Ed.]

[76] Hist. Francor. l. 2. c. 34. (p. 89 e. 5.) . . . . Rogationes, quas ante Ascensionis Dominicæ triumphum celebramus.

[77] C. 27. (t. 4. p. 1408 e.) Rogationes, id est, litanias, ante Ascensionem Domini . . . placuit celebrari, ita ut præmissum triduanum jejunium in Dominicæ Ascensionis solennitate [al. festivitate] solvatur, per quod triduum servi et ancillæ ab omni opere relaxentur, quo magis plebs universa conveniat: quo triduo omnes abstineant, et quadragesimalibus cibis utantur.

[78] De Offic. Eccles. c. 28. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 15. p. 198. 4.) Hispani autem, propter hoc quod scriptum, *Non possunt filii sponsi lugere, quamdiu cum illis est sponsus,* infra quinquagesimum Paschæ recusantes jejunare, litanias suas post Pentecosten posuerunt.

[79] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1567 d. et p. 1568 a.) Ut litaniæ post Pentecosten a quinta feria usque in sabbatum celebrentur. So it is in the title of the canon: and in the body of it. . . Ut . . per hoc triduum abstinentia celebretur.—C. 3. (ibid. p. 1568 b.) Item secunda litania facienda est [al. secundæ litaniæ faciendæ sunt] Kalendis Novembris; ea tamen conditione, &c.

tide. And they ordered a second litany to be used on the first day of November. The fifth Council of Toledo[80] appointed another such litany and fast to be celebrated yearly for three days, commencing on the thirteenth day of December. The sixth Council of Toledo[81] confirmed this decree about two years after, anno 638, and made it a general rule for all the Churches of Spain and Gallicia, and Gallia Narbonensis, which was at this time under the government of the Gothic King Chintillan, and in the seventeenth Council of Toledo[82], anno 694, under King Egicanes, a more general decree was made, 'that such litanies should be used in every month throughout the year.' And so by degrees these solemn supplications came to be used weekly, on Wednesdays and Fridays, the ancient stationary days in all Churches.

Of the distinction between greater and lesser litanies.

11. In the mean time Gregory the Great instituted some such rogations at Rome, and one particularly on the twenty-fifth day of April, which goes by the name of *litania septiformis*, because he ordered the Church to go in procession *in seven distinct classes;* first the clergy, then the laymen, next the monks, after them the virgins, then the married women, next the widows, and last of all the poor and the children. This is mentioned both by Gregory himself[83], and Walafridus Strabo[84], who give it the name of *litania major:* whence

[80] C. 1. (t. 5. p. 1735 e.) Ut a die Iduum Decembrium litania [al. litaniæ] triduo ubique annua successione peragatur [al. peragantur] &c.

[81] C. 2. (ibid. p. 1742 d.) Universalis auctoritate censemus Concilii, ut hi dies litaniarum, qui in Synodo præmissa sunt instituti, ... annuo recursu omni observatione habeantur celeberrimi.

[82] C. 6. (t. 6. p. 1367 b.) Quando [al. quamquam] priscorum patrum institutio, per totum annum, per singulorum mensium cursum, litaniarum vota decreverit persolvendum, ... decernimus, ut deinceps per totum annum, in cunctis duodecim mensibus, per universas Hispaniæ et Galliarum provincias pro statu ecclesiæ Dei, pro incolumitate principis nostri, atque salvatione populi, et indulgentia totius peccati, et a cunctorum fidelium cordibus expulsione diaboli, exomologeses votis gliscentibus celebrentur.

[83] L. 11. Ep. 2. (c. 6. t. 5. p. 1510 e.) Proinde, fratres carissimi, contrito corde, et correctis operibus, crastina die primo diluculo ad septiformem litaniam juxta distributionem inferius designatam, devota mente, cum lacrimis veniamus... Litania clericorum exeat ab ecclesia beati Ioannis Baptistæ: ... litania virorum, ab ecclesia beati martyris Marcelli: litania monachorum, ab ecclesia martyrum Ioannis et Pauli: litania ancillarum Dei, ab ecclesia beatorum martyrum Cosmæ et Damiani: litania fœminarum conjugatarum, ab ecclesia beati primi martyris Stephani: litania viduarum, ab ecclesia beati martyris Vitalis: litania pauperem et infantium, ab ecclesia beatæ martyris Cæciliæ.

[84] De Offic. Eccles. c. 28. (ap.

some have been led into a mistake to think the Roman litanies were distinguished by the name of *the greater litanies* from those of Mamercus, which they call *the less.* So Hamon Lestrange[85] and others, in their accounts of these things. But the French writers do not allow of this distinction. Cellotius[86] says, 'the rogation or litany of Mamercus was always dignified with the title of *litania major* by their old writers, as well as that of Gregory, and that Gregory's Litany was of little use among them.' It is certain the Council of Mentz[87] and the Capitulars of Charles the Great[88], which repeat the words of that Council, applied the name of *litania major* to their own rogations before Ascension. And Cellotius says, Gualterus Aurelianensis and Strabo both give it the same title. But still he does not tell us what they mean by the *litania minor, the lesser litany,* in contradistinction to the greater.

If the reader will take my conjecture, it is no more but the known form, *Kyrie eleison!* as the Latins read from the Greek, Κύριε ἐλέησον· *Lord, have mercy upon us!* or, *Lord, have mercy upon them!* if they were praying for others. As

Bibl. Max. t. 15. p. 197. 14.) Litanias, id est, rogationes publicas, quas *majores* vocamus, Romani una die denominata, id est, 7 Kal. Maii, annuatim facere solent: quas Gregorius Papa initio ordinationis suæ instituit, &c.

[85] Alliance of Divine Offices, ch. 4. p. 100. (Reprint, p. 145.) Next Mamercus comes Gregory the Great, the supposed author of the Great Litany, that of Mamercus being styled the Less, &c.

[86] Not. in Capitul. Gualter. Aurelianens. (CC. t. 8. p. 649 C.) Nam litaniam majorem Ordo Romanus nuncupat eam, quæ, auctore Gregorio Magno, 7 Kalendis Maii, celebratur ad festum Sancti Marci. Minorem vero illam, quæ per triduum rogationum a Mamerto, Viennensi episcopo, instituta, *apud nos usque hodie pro diversis calamitatibus devotissime recolitur,* ut ait idem Ordo. Non assentientibus nostris scriptoribus, qui priorem simpliciter Romanam nominant, et in Galliæ usu ægre retentam subindicant: ut in Herardo videre est de *Litania Romana, 7 Kal. Maii, ut rememoretur.* Ut videlicet ejus commemoratio fiat, quæ nisi studiose commendata, dilaberetur. Majorem autem litaniam non aliam habent, quam triduum rogationum: et manifeste hanc nominat Capitulare Caroli Magni ex Concilio Moguntino: *Placuit nobis, ut litania major observanda sit a cunctis Christianis diebus tribus.* Walafridus autem Strabo, utrique, tum Romanæ, tum isti Gallicanæ, *majoris* nomen tribuit.

[87] Anno 813. c. 33. (t. 7. p. 1249 e.) Placuit nobis, ut litania major observanda sit a cunctis Christianis diebus tribus, sicut legendo reperimus, et sicut sancti patres nostri instituerunt, non equitando, nec pretiosis vestibus induti, sed discalceati, cinere et cilicio induti, nisi infirmitas impedierit.

[88] L. 5. c. 85. [al. 150.] ap. Capitul. Reg. Franc. ex Ed. Baluz. Paris. 1677. (t. 1. p. 853.) *De Letania Majore.* Placuit nobis ut letania major observanda sit a cunctis Christianis diebus tribus.

this was the constant response made by the people to each petition of their larger supplications for the catechumens and others, as we shall see hereafter; so it was used sometimes by itself, in all their offices, as a shorter form of supplication: and then it had the nature of a litany by itself, and was not a part of a larger prayer. This is evident from the order made in the Council of Vaison[89] for introducing the use of it into the French Churches. 'Whereas,' say they, 'it is a very useful and agreeable custom in the Roman Church, and all the provinces of Italy and the East, to use the frequent repetition of the *Kyrie eleison! Lord, have mercy upon us!* with great affection and contrition: we therefore decree, that the same holy custom be introduced into all our Churches, both at morning and evening prayer, and in the communion-service.' The Greeks usually said, Lord, have mercy upon us! without adding the other part, Christ, have mercy upon us! But the Latins used both clauses, and repeated them alternately, as we now do, first the minister, and then the people; whereas, by the Greeks the supplication was made by the common voice of all together. This difference is noted by Gregory the Great[90], but it does not detract from our observation, but rather confirms it, that this was a short form of supplication used one way or other in all Churches, and that as a part of all their daily offices; whence it borrowed the name of the *lesser litany*, in opposition to the greater litanies, which were distinct, complete, and solemn services, adapted to particular times, or extraordinary occasions. I must note further, that the greater litanies are sometimes[91] termed *exomologeses, confessions;*

[89] Vasens. 2. c. 3. (t. 4. p. 1680 c.) Et quia tam in sede apostolica, quam etiam per totas Orientis [al. orientales] atque Italiæ provincias, dulcis et nimium salubris consuetudo intromissa est, ut *Kyrie eleison!* frequentius cum grandi affectu ac compunctione dicatur: placuit etiam nobis, ut in omnibus ecclesiis nostris ista consuetudo sancta, et ad matutinam, et ad missas, et ad vesperam, Deo propitiante, [al. propitio,] intromittatur.

[90] L. 7. Ep. 64. ad Ioan. Syracus. (CC. t. 5. p. 1348 b.) *Kyrie eleison!* nos neque diximus, sicut a Græcis dicitur: quia in Græcis simul omnes dicunt. Apud nos autem a clericis dicitur, et a populo respondetur: et totidem vicibus etiam *Christe eleison!* dicitur, quod [al. quot] apud Græcos nullo modo dicitur.

[91] Vid. C. Mogunt. c. 32. (CC. t. 7. p. 1249 d.) *Litaniæ* Græco nomine appellantur, quæ Latine dicuntur *rogationes*. Inter litanias autem et exomologeses hoc differt; quod *exomologeses* pro sola peccatorum confessione agantur: *litaniæ* vero indicantur propter rogandum Deum, et impetrandum in aliquo misericordiam ejus. Sed nunc jam

because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins, were usually joined with supplication to avert God's wrath, and reconcile him to a sinful people.

12. Sometimes to these solemn supplications they added processions, which at first had nothing of harm or superstition in them: for they were only of the same nature with their processions at a funeral, when they carried a corpse with the solemnity of psalmody to its interment. They sometimes made their processions, and sometimes their litanies, as occasion required, in the open field: but here was no pomp of relics, nor exposing of the eucharist to adoration, in such solemnities: they only carried the cross, as they did also in some of their night-processions for psalmody, as the badge of their profession, before them. Of their processions.

Of this indeed there are some instances as early as Chrysostom: for it is noted in his Life by Palladius[92], that his enemies trampled under foot the sign of the cross, which the people carried on their shoulders, as they made their litanies in the field. And in those vigils which he set up at Constantinople in opposition to the Arians, the historians[93] say they had silver crosses given them by the empress for this purpose. And the Laws of Justinian[94] expressly provided, 'that as these litanies should not be celebrated without the bishop or the clergy; so the crosses to be used in these solemnities should not be reposited in any places but the churches, nor be carried by any but such as were appointed.' And because in these solemn processions some were inclined to appear in pomp unsuitable

utrumque vocabulum sub una designatione habetur.

92 Vit. Chrysost. c. 15. p. 27. (ad calc. Oper. Chrysost. t. 13. p. 58 d.) Πορφύριος δὲ καὶ Οὐαλεντῖνος ὁ Κόμης μετὰ τῶν ὁπλιτῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐλεηλάτουν, τὸ φρικωδέστατον τοῦ σταυροῦ σημεῖον, ὃ ἀντὶ διδασκάλου ἐπ' ὤμων φέροντες ἐπὶ γῆς ἀσπόρου ἐλιτάνευον, τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ποσὶ συμπατήσαντες.

93 Socrat. l. 6. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 322. 14.) Ὡς γὰρ λαμπρότεροι οἱ τοῦ Ὁμοουσίου ὕμνοι ἐν ταῖς νυκτεριναῖς ὑμνολογίαις ἐδείκνυντο· ἐπινενόηντο γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῦ σταυροὶ ἀργυροῖ, φέροντες φῶτα ἐκ τῶν κηρίνων λαμπάδων, τῆς βασιλίδος Εὐδοξίας παρεχούσης τὴν εἰς αὐτὰ δαπάνην· πλῆθος ὄντες οἱ Ἀρειανίζοντες, καὶ ζηλοτυπίᾳ ληφθέντες, ἀμύνεσθαί τε καὶ συμπληγάδας ἐπεχείρουν ποιεῖν.—Sozom. l. 8. c. 8. (ibid. p. 336. 28.) . . . Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ σταυρῶν ἀργυρᾶ σημεῖα ὑπὸ κηροῖς ἡμμένοις προηγοῦντο.

94 Novel. 123. c. 32. (t. 5. p. 556.) Omnibus autem laicis interdicimus litanias facere sine sanctis episcopis, et qui sub eis sunt reverendissimis clericis, ... sed et ipsas honorandas cruces, cum quibus et in litaniis ingrediuntur, non alibi nisi in venerabilibus locis reponi, &c.

to the occasion, with gay clothing and on horseback, therefore both these things were particularly forbidden. Sidonius[95] notes it 'as a great absurdity for men to appear, *castorinati ad litanias, dressed up in their rich beaver cloths at a litany,* because sackcloth and ashes were more becoming such solemnities, which were intended for fasting, and mourning, and supplication, and humiliation, and confession of sins, after the example of the Ninevites in their solemn addresses to God.' And for this reason the Canons[96] forbad any one to appear 'on horseback or in rich apparel at the rogation solemnities, but rather *discalceati,* in sackcloth and ashes, unless he had the excuse of infirmity to hinder him.' For these rogations were intended 'to implore God's mercy in the most humble manner, and with the most ardent affections of soul to beseech him to avert all sicknesses and plagues and tribulations; to repel the evils of pestilence, war, hail, and drought; to compose the temper of the air, so that it may be for the health of men's bodies, and fertility of the earth; that he would keep all the elements in due order and harmony, and grant men peaceable times;' as Eucherius[97] relates the chief heads of them in his sermon upon this subject. Whereas yet we may observe, no prayers or intercessions were made to saints or angels, as in the modern litanies of the Romish Church, but to God only, as shall be shown at large in the following chapters.

CHAP. II.

That the devotions of the ancient Church were paid to every Person of the Blessed Trinity.

Proofs of the worship of Christ,

1. Having thus distinguished the ambiguity of the names of the ancient worship, and settled the true meaning of them, our

[95] L. 5. Ep. 7. ad Thaumast. p. 327.} .... Libenter incedunt armati ad epulas, albati ad exequias, pelliti ad ecclesias, pullati ad nuptias, castorinati ad litanias.

[96] Vid. C. Mogunt. c. 33. See before, s. 11. n. 87, preceding.—Conf. Burchard. Decret. l. 13. c. 7. (fol. 158. verso, col. dextr.) Cumque Dominus pestem misericorditer abstulisset, hi dies in consuetudinem annuæ celebritatis venerunt, ut per Galliarum provincias ante Ascensionis diem celebrarentur.

[97] Hom. de Litaniis, (ap. Bibl. Magn. ut supr. t. 5. part. 1. p. 568 g. 10.) Exoraturi sumus, ut Dominus infirmitatibus, plagis, tribulationibus interdicat: malum pestilentiæ, hostilitates, grandines, siccitates repellat: cœli temperiem pro salute corporum, pro terrarum fœcunditate componat: elementorum pacem cum temporum tranquillitate concedat, peccata dimittat, flagella submoveat.—See n. 75, preceding.

next inquiry must be into the object of the Christian worship, to see what persons they were to whom they paid their devotion. That which makes this inquiry necessary, which otherwise might have been omitted, is the prevalency of two contrary errors, too much reigning in these latter ages: one of which asserts, that the Father alone was the sole object of true divine worship, and not the Son, or Holy Ghost; and the other, that saints and angels had also a share in it. To show the falseness of both which pretences, I shall a little detain the reader with the proofs and evidences of the contrary assertions.

as the Son of God, or the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity in the first century.

And first, to show that Christ, as the Son of God and the Second Person of the ever Blessed Trinity, was the object of divine worship in all ages, we will begin with the original of Christian worship, and carry the inquiry through the three first centuries.

For the first age, the Scripture is sufficient evidence of the Christians' practice. For not to insist on the precept of honouring the Son as they honoured the Father; or the form of baptism, in which they are commanded to join the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one act of worship; or the injunction to believe in the Son, as they believed in the Father; with many other acts of internal worship, peculiar to God alone: I only argue from their example and practice. St. Stephen the protomartyr, when he was sealing his confession with his blood, breathed out his last in a prayer to Christ, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" And, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!" (Acts 7, 59 and 60.) St. Paul professes he never baptized any but only in the name of Christ. (1 Cor. 1, 13—15.) And his common forms of blessing were with invocation of the name of Christ: "Grace be to you and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ!" And, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all!" as the solemn forms run almost in all his Epistles, both in the beginning and the conclusion of them. Nay, so common was this practice, that among other titles of the believers, at their first rise and appearance in the world, they were distinguished by the character of "those that called on the name of Christ." (Acts 9, 14 and 21. 1 Cor. 1, 2. 2 Tim. 2, 22.)

Some critics, I know, would have the phrase ἐπικαλούμενοι

τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ to be taken passively only for *those who were named by the name of Christ*, that is, *Christians*. But this criticism is of no weight; for they were called invokers, or worshippers of Christ, before the name *Christian* was known in the world: for this name was not used till some time after St. Paul's conversion, when, as St. Luke says expressly, (Acts 11, 26.) "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." But they were worshippers of him before, and therefore were distinguished by the character of *the men that called upon his name*. Many other such like evidences are obvious to any one that reads the New Testament: I only add that of the Revelation, 5, 8—13., where the Church in heaven and earth together is represented as offering both prayers and hymns to Christ: "When he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

Proofs of the same in the second century.

2. We have here seen the model of the worship of Christ, as begun and settled in the practice of the Church in the first age. And we shall find it continued in the same manner in those that followed immediately after.

For Pliny[1], who lived in the beginning of the second cen-

[1] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 278.) Affirmabant . . . . quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.

tury, and as a judge under Trajan took the confessions of some revolting Christians, says, 'they declared to him, they were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and among other parts of their worship sing an hymn to Christ, as to their God.' Which is a plain indication of their worship of Christ on the Lord's-day.

Not long after this lived Polycarp[2], who joins God the Father and the Son together in his prayers for grace and benediction upon men. 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ himself, the eternal High-Priest, the Son of God, build you up in faith and truth, and in all meekness, to live without anger, in patience, in long suffering and forbearance, and give you a lot and part among the saints, and to us with you, and to all them that are under heaven, who shall believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, and in his Father, who raised him from the dead!' And so he begins his Epistle, 'Mercy and peace from God Almighty, and from the Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied unto you!' And when he came to his martyrdom, he made a prayer to God at the stake, before he was burnt, concluding it with this doxology to the whole Trinity: 'I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee for all things, together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom unto thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory both now and for ever, world without end. Amen.'

When Polycarp was dead, the Church of Smyrna wrote a circular Epistle to other Churches, to give an account of his sufferings, wherein[3] they relate this remarkable occurrence,

[2] Ep. ad Philip. n. 12. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 189.) Deus autem et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ipse sempiternus Pontifex, Dei Filius, Christus Jesus, ædificet vos in fide et veritate, et in omni mansuetudine, ...et det vobis sortem et partem inter sanctos suos, et nobis vobiscum, et omnibus, qui sunt sub cœlo, qui credituri sunt in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in ipsius Patrem, &c.

[3] Martyr. Polycarp. n. 14. (Cotel. ibid. p. 199.) *Περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σε, εὐλογῶ σε, δοξάζω σε, σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητῷ σοῦ Παιδὶ, μεθ' οὗ σοι καὶ Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.*—Eusebius, l. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 169. 40.) ex Ep. Eccles. Smyrnens., reads thus with a little variation of the particles,—*Διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σοῦ Παιδός· δι' οὗ σοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ.* But this makes no alteration in the sense: for still it concludes with a doxology to the Three Divine Persons:—'By whom and with whom unto thee and the Holy Spirit be glory for ever and ever. Amen.'

'that as soon as he was dead, the Jews suggested to the Heathen judge, that he should not suffer the Christians to take Polycarp's body and bury it, lest they should leave their crucified Master, and begin to worship this other.' 'Not considering,' says the Epistle[2], 'that we can never either forsake the worship of Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all those who are saved in the whole world, the just for the unjust, or worship any other. For we worship him as being the Son of God; but the martyrs we only love, as they deserve, for their great affection to their King and Master, and as being disciples and followers of their Lord, whose partners and fellow-disciples we desire to be.' This is an unanswerable testimony, to prove both the divine worship of Christ, as the true Son of God, and that no martyr or other saint was worshipped in those days.

Not long after this lived Justin Martyr, who, in his Second Apology, to wipe off the charge of atheism, brought against them by the Heathens, who objected to them, that they had cast off the worship of God, answers[3], 'That they worshipped and adored still the God of righteousness, and his Son, that came from him, and taught both them and the host of good angels, who followed him, and were made like unto him, as also the Holy Spirit of prophecy: to these they paid a rational and true honour, as they always frankly owned to all such as were disposed to learn.'

Bellarmin[4] very fraudulently urges this place, to prove the

[2] Ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 171. 1.) et ap. Cotel. ibid. n. 17. (v. 2. p. 200.) Μὴ, φησὶν, ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, τοῦτον ἄρξωνται σέβεσθαι. . . . ἀγνοοῦντες, ὅτι οὔτε τὸν Χριστὸν ποτὲ καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, ἄμωμον ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτωλῶν, οὔτε ἕτερόν τινα σέβεσθαι. Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ, υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ, προσκυνοῦμέν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον· ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι.

[3] Apol. 2. (p. 56 c.) Καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων Θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου, καὶ Πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἑπομένων καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, Πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες, καὶ παντὶ βουλομένῳ μαθεῖν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες.

[4] De Beatitud. Sanctor. l. 1. c. 13. t. 1. p. 1957. (t. 2. p. 728 b.) Argumentum quartum sumitur ex confessione patrum, qui a temporibus Apostolorum, usque ad nostra tempora floruerunt. Justinus, in

worship of angels: as if Justin had said, that they worshipped the Father, the Son, the angels, and the Holy Spirit; whereas he says nothing of the worship of angels, but that the angels were taught by the Son, and that the Son together with the Father and Holy Spirit were the object of Christian worship. Which he repeats again in his foresaid Apology[5], saying, in answer to the same objection, 'that they could demonstrate, that as they worshipped God, the Creator of all things, so with equal reason they worshipped Jesus Christ in the second place, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy in the third, knowing Jesus Christ to be the Son of the true God.' For, whereas the Heathens objected further, that it was madness in them, next to the immutable and true God, maker of all things, to give the second place to a crucified man, he tells them, 'they understood not the mystery of this practice.' Which shows, that as they worshipped Christ, so they worshipped him as the true Son of God, and not as a creature: for he tells the Emperors a little after[6], 'they held it unlawful to worship any but God alone.' Therefore in their practice they also showed their belief of his true divinity: since they worshipped him only upon this foundation and supposition, that he was truly God and not a mere man; and to have done it upon any other supposition, had been gross idolatry, by their own confession. Which I wish were duly considered by those, who now write against the divinity of Christ, and absurdly pretend, that all the Fathers of the three first ages were of their opinion. For this is only to make them guilty of the grossest idolatry, and involve them in a monstrous contradiction; whilst they

2 Apolog. p. 2., loquens nomine omnium Christianorum, et fidem totius ecclesiæ explicans, *Sed*, inquit, *et illum*, (Deum Patrem) *et ejus Filium, qui venit, nosque hæc docuit, et aliorum sequentium, similiumque bonorum angelorum exercitus, et Spiritum propheticum colimus atque adoramus, verboque et re, seu veritate veneramur, idque omnibus, qui discere volunt, ut docti institutique sumus, copiose tradimus.*

[5] Apol. 2. (p. 60 c.) Τὸν Δημιουργὸν . . . καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν . . . Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, Πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν ἀποδείξομεν. Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ μανίαν ἡμῶν καταφαίνονται, δευτέραν χώραν μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεὸν, καὶ γεννήτορα τῶν ἁπάντων, ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι διδόναι ἡμᾶς λέγοντες· ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ἐν τούτῳ μυστήριον.—In the Dialogue with Trypho, (p. 302 b.) he styles him, Θεὸν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ προσκυνητὸν, *the Mighty God that was to be adored*, upon the authority of the Psalmist.

[6] Ibid. (p. 64 d.) Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν, κ. τ. λ.

pretended to worship none but God alone, and yet gave divine honour to One, whom, if our modern representers say true, they did not believe to be truly God by nature, but only a creature.

But to go on with the inquiry, as to what concerns the object of their worship in practice;—Athenagoras[7] answers the charge of atheism after the same manner as Justin Martyr had done before him: 'We are no atheists, who worship the Creator of all things, and his Word, that proceedeth from him.' Minucius Felix[8], to another objection, that they worshipped a crucified man, answers, 'that they were mistaken in the charge; for he, whom they worshipped, was God, and not a mere mortal man. Miserable is he, whose hope is only in man; for his help is at an end, when the life of man is extinct.'

About this time lived Lucian the Heathen, who in one of his Dialogues[9] takes notice of the Christian worship. For bringing in a Christian instructing a catechumen, he makes the catechumen ask this question, 'By whom shall I swear?' And he, that personates the Christian, answers, 'By the God that reigns on high, the Great, Immortal, Heavenly God, and the Son of the Father, and the Spirit proceeding from the Father, One in Three, and Three in One. Take these for your Jupiter, imagine this to be your God.' Which evidently shows, that Lucian had learned this from the Christian institutions, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the object of their divine worship. And he elsewhere[10] objects to them the worship of their crucified impostor, as he blasphemously terms our Blessed Lord.

[7] Legat. pro Christianis, ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 76. (ad. calc. Just. Mart. p. 34 d.) Οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἄθεοι, Θεὸν ἄγοντες τὸν Ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πάντος, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Λόγον.

[8] Octav. p. 88. (c. 29. p. 147.) Nam quod religioni nostræ hominem noxium et crucem ejus ascribitis, longe de vicinia veritatis erratis, qui putatis Deum credi aut meruisse noxium, aut potuisse terrenum. Næ ille miserabilis, cujus in homine mortali spes omnis innititur, totum enim ejus auxilium cum extincto homine finitur!

[9] Philopatris, prope finem. (v. 9. p. 248.)
Καὶ τίνα ἐπομόσομαί γε;
Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν, Μέγαν, Ἄμβροτον, Οὐρανίωνα,
Υἱὸν Πατρὸς, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
Ἓν ἐκ Τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ Ἑνὸς Τρία·
Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ Θεόν.

[10] De Mort. Peregrin. p. 764. (v. 8. p. 280.) Ἐπειδὰν ἅπαξ παραβάντες, [οἱ Χριστιανοὶ] θεοὺς μὲν Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσωνται, τὸν δ' ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιῶσι.

Not long after Irenæus[11], speaking of the miracles which the Church wrought in his time, particularly in casting out devils, says 'She did this, not by invocation of angels, nor by enchantments, nor by any other wicked piece of curiosity, but by directing her prayers, clean, and pure, and openly to the God over all; and by invocating the name of Jesus Christ, she works miracles for the benefit of men, and not for their seduction.' And that this was so, appears further from some of the forms of prayer used then in the Church for the energumens in the public service, one of which is recorded by the author of the Constitutions[12] directed personally to Christ, under the title of 'the Only Begotten God, who binds the strong one, that is the Devil:' which prayer I need not repeat here, because the reader may find it at length hereafter[13] in the service of the catechumens.

About the same time with Irenæus, lived Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who though he does not expressly mention the worship of Christ, yet he acknowledges him to be God of God, and says[14], 'the world was made by him: for when the Father said, "Let us make man in our own image," he spake this to no other[15], but to his own Word, and his own Wisdom;' that is, the Son and Holy Spirit; whom he expressly styles[16] by the name of 'the Trinity in the Godhead,' and says elsewhere[17], that 'God is to be worshipped, and nothing else besides him, who is the true God, the ordainer of kings; who may be honoured, but not worshipped, because they are only men, and not God.' From all which it is easy to infer, that Theophilus thought Christ the object of divine worship, as the living and true God, and that it would be idolatry to give divine worship

[11] L. 2. c. 57. (p. 189. 8.) Nec invocationibus angelicis facit aliquid, nec incantationibus, nec reliqua [leg. aliqua] prava curiositate, sed munde [et pure] et manifeste orationes dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, et nomen Domini nostri Iesu Christi invocans, virtutes secundum utilitates hominum, sed non ad seductionem perficit.

[12] L. 8. c. 7. tot. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 394.) Ὁ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δείσας [*legendum*, δήσας] καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσας, κ.τ.λ.

[13] B. 14. ch. 5. v. 7.

[14] Ad Autolycum, l. 2. p. 130. (ad calc. Just. Mart. p. 100 c.) Θεὸς οὖν ὢν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πεφυκώς.

[15] Ibid. p. 114. (p. 96 c.) Οὐκ ἄλλῳ δὲ τινι εἴρηκε, ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ Λόγῳ, καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ Σοφίᾳ.

[16] Ibid. p. 106. (p. 94 d.)... Τύποι εἰσὶν Τριάδος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ.

[17] Ibid. l. 1. p. 30. (p. 76 c.)..... Θεῷ δὲ τῷ ὄντως Θεῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ προσκυνῶ, κ. τ. λ.

to Christ, upon any other supposition than that he is true God as well as man.

In the same age Clemens Alexandrinus is an illustrious witness of this practice. For in his Exhortation to the Gentiles[18] he styles him the living God, that was then worshipped and adored: 'Believe,' says he, 'O man, in him, who is both Man and God: believe, O man, in him who suffered death, and yet is adored as the living God.' In the end of his Pædagogue[19] he himself addresses his prayers to the Son, jointly with the Father, in these words: 'Be merciful to thy children, O Master, O Father, thou Ruler of Israel, O Son, and Father, who are both One, our Lord!' And in the conclusion of the book[20] he has this doxology to the whole Trinity: 'Let us give thanks to the only Father and Son, to the Son and the Father, to the Son, our Teacher and Master, with the Holy Spirit; One in all respects; in whom are all things; by whom all things are one; by whom is eternal existence; whose members we are; whose is the glory and the ages; who is the Perfect Good, the Perfect Beauty, All-wise, and All-just: to whom be glory, both now and for ever! Amen.'

Contemporary with Clemens was Athenogenes, the martyr, who suffered about the year 196. St. Basil[21] says, he composed a sacred hymn, setting forth the glory of the Holy Ghost. From whence we may collect, that it did the same for Christ as the Son of God. The learned Dr. Cave[22], by a little

[18] Protreptic. (p. 84. 1.) *Πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρωπῷ καὶ Θεῷ. Πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι καὶ προσκυνομένῳ Θεῷ ζῶντι.*

[19] L. 3. c. 12. (p. 311. 3.) *Ἵλαθι τοῖς σοῖς, Παιδαγωγὲ, παιδίοις, Πατὲρ, Ἡνίοχε Ἰσραὴλ, Υἱὲ καὶ Πατὲρ, Ἓν ἄμφω, Κύριε.*

[20] Ibid. (p. ead. 13.).... *Εὐχαριστοῦντας αἰνεῖν, αἰνοῦντας εὐχαριστεῖν, τῷ μόνῳ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, Υἱῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ Υἱῷ, σὺν καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· παντὰ τῷ Ἑνί· ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα· δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα ἕν· δι' ὃν τὸ ἀεί· οὗ μέλη πάντες· οὗ δόξα, αἰῶνες· πάντα τῷ Ἀγαθῷ, πάντα τῷ Καλῷ, πάντα τῷ Σοφῷ· τῷ Δικαίῳ τὰ πάντα· ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.*—Conf. Stromat. l. 7. c. 7. (p. 851. 15.) *Σέβειν δὲ δεῖν ἐγκελευόμεθα καὶ τιμᾶν τὸν αὐτὸν, καὶ Λόγον Σωτῆρά τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἡγεμόνα εἶναι πεισθέντες· καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Πατέρα, κ. τ. λ.*

[21] De Spir. Sanct. c. 29. t. 2. p. 359. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 86 b. n. 73.) *Καὶ ὅστις μὲν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίου εὐχαριστίας, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν· ὁ μέν τοι λαὸς ἀρχαίαν ἀφίησι τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ οὐδενὶ πώποτε ἀσεβεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν οἱ λέγοντες· Αἰνοῦμεν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ. Εἰ δέ τις καὶ τὸν ὕμνον Ἀθηνογένους ἔγνω, ὃν ὥσπέρ τι ἄλλο ἐξιτήριον,* [al. *ἀλεξητήριον* omitting *ἄλλο,*] *τοῖς συνοῦσιν αὐτῷ καταλέλοιπεν, ὁρμῶν ἤδη πρὸς τὴν διὰ πυρὸς τελείωσιν, οἶδε καὶ τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων γνώμην, ὅπως εἶχον περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος.*

[22] Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 60.) Athenogenes, martyr celeberrimus, Cle-

mistake of what St. Basil says, supposes Athenogenes to have been the author of those two ancient hymns called the Morning and Evening Hymns, which the reader will find related at length hereafter[23], under the titles of the Great Doxology, *Glory be to God on high, &c.*, and *Hymnus Lucernalis.* But it is plain from St. Basil, that the hymn of Athenogenes was distinct from these. For he makes no mention of the Morning Hymn, and says expressly of the Evening Hymn, that he knew not who was the author of it. However it was an hymn of ancient use in the Church, addressed immediately to Christ, and containing this doxology to the whole Trinity, Ὑμνοῦμεν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ,—*We laud the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of God!* which St. Basil urges, as we do here, as a distinct testimony from that of Athenogenes, and as a further instance of the Church's ancient practice in giving divine honour and worship, not only to the Father, but to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

About the same time suffered Andronicus, the martyr, in the Acts of whose Passion[24] it is objected to him by the Heathen judge, 'that Christ, whom he invocated and worshipped, was a man that had suffered under the government of Pontius Pilate, and that the Acts of his Passion were then exstant.' Their worship of Christ was so well known to the Heathens, that at every turn, we see, it was objected to them. And their answer was always the same,—'that they worshipped him indeed, but not as a mere man, but as God, the Son of God by nature, and of the same substance with the Father.'

menti Alexandrino σύγχρονος fuisse et igne martyrium obiisse videtur. Scripsit hymnum matutinum, qui sic incipit Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, et hymnum vespertinum incipientem, Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης, quos ad martyrium festinantem, tanquam valedictionis munus, discipulis suis reliquisse eum tradit Sanctus Basilius de Spirit. Sanct. c. 29. [This passage is differently worded in the *Editio novissima, ab autore ipsomet ante obitum recognita et auctior facta, Basil.* 1741—45, and shows that Dr. Cave had previously changed his opinion; for he says, (v. 1. p. 94.) Huic nonnulli ascribunt hymnum matutinum ..... et hymnum vespertinum ..... quos ad martyrium festinantem, tanquam valedictionis munus, discipulis suis reliquisse volunt, Basiliumque ejus rei adducere solent. De hymno matutino ne verbulum habet Basilius..... Quisquis vero Basilii locum serio perpenderit, facile videbit Basilium hymnum vespertinum ab Athenogenis hymno aperte distinguere. Ed.]

[23] See ch. 10. s. 9. and ch. 11. s. 5. of this Book.

[24] Ap. Baron. an. 290. n. 26. (t. 2. p. 671 c.) Non scis, quem invocas Christum, hominem quendam factum, sub custodia Pontii Pilati punitum; cujus exstant acta passionis.

Which is the answer that Tertullian, who is the last writer of the second age, makes to this objection. For whereas it was objected[25], 'that they were worshippers of a man, whom all the world knew to be a man, and the Jews had condemned as a man:' to this he answers[26], not by denying that they worshipped him, but by explaining the reasons and foundation of their worship: 'Because they knew him to be the true natural Son of God, by a spiritual generation, and therefore called God and the Son of God, because he was of one and the same essence or substance. For God was a Spirit: and the Son was Spirit of Spirit and God of God, as light is of light. In that manner he was begotten of God, so as to be God and the Son of God, and they were both One.' In another place[27], dissuading Christian women from marrying with unbelievers, among other arguments, he uses this: 'That in such a family there could be no mention of God, no invocation of Christ, no cherishing of faith by their joint reading of the Scripture.' At the same time he tells us[28], 'a Christian could pray to no other but the eternal, the living and true God: he could not ask such things, as they were wont to ask in prayer, of any other but him, from whom he knew he could obtain them, and who alone was able to give them.' Now this had been absurd and ridiculous arguing to the Heathens, had not Christians believed Christ to be the eternal, living and true God. Their arguments might easily have been retorted, and charged with contradiction; and they would have stood self-condemned by their own practice, if whilst they were arguing against the Heathen idols upon this foot, that nothing was to be worshipped but the

[25] Apol. c. 21. (p. 19 a.) Sed et vulgus jam scit Christum, ut aliquem hominum, [al. hominem utique aliquem,] qualem Judæi judicaverunt, quo facilius quis nos hominis cultores existimaverit.

[26] Ibid. (c.) .... Ita hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum, et idcirco Filium Dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ: nam et Deus Spiritus.—Ibid. (c.) De Spiritu Spiritus, et de Deo Deus, ut lumen de lumine accensum, ... Ita et quod de Deo profectum est, Deus est et Dei Filius, et Unus ambo.

[27] Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 6. (p. 170 a.) Quæ Dei mentio? Quæ Christi invocatio? Ubi fomenta fidei de scripturarum interjectione? [al. interlectione?]

[28] Apol. c. 30. (p. 27 a, b.) Nos enim pro salute imperatorum [al. imperatoris] Deum invocamus æternum, Deum verum, Deum vivum, quem et ipsi imperatores propitium sibi præter cæteros malunt. Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo me scio consecuturum, quoniam et ipse est qui solus præstat.

eternal, living, and true God, they themselves had worshipped one, who fell short of that character.

Therefore we must conclude, that as it is plain from the foregoing testimonies, that Christians did give divine worship to Christ in this age, so they did it only upon this supposition, that he was the Eternal, Living, and True God, as the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father; and that however They differed, as far as it was necessary for a father and son to be distinct, yet they were but One Creator, and One God.

Proofs of the worship of Christ in the third century.

3. We are now come to the third century, where we have first an illustrious testimony for the worship of Christ, as God, in the Fragments of Caius, a Roman presbyter, preserved by Eusebius, out of his Book called the Labyrinth, written against Artemon, one of the first that appeared against the divinity of our Saviour. Here, among many other things, showing the novelty of that heresy, he observes[28], 'there were anciently many psalms and hymns composed by the brethren, and transcribed by the faithful, setting forth the praises of Christ as the Word of God, and ascribing divinity to him.' And that such sort of hymns were used in the service of the Church, we learn from another passage in the same Eusebius, taken out of the Council of Antioch, against Paulus Samosatensis, the heretical bishop of Antioch, about the middle of this century. For there[29] he is charged as 'giving orders to forbid the use of such psalms or hymns as were used to be sung in the Church to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, under pretence that they were only the novel compositions of late and modern authors. Whilst, in the mean time, he suborned women on the great day of the Lord's passion or the resurrection, (for *pascha* will signify both,) to sing hymns composed to his own honour; where, among other things, he, that would not allow Christ any other but an earthly original, was not ashamed to hear himself blasphemously extolled as an angel come down from heaven; which,' as those holy fathers observe, 'was enough to make an

[28] L. 5. c. 28. (p. 252. 20.) Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι, καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπαρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσαι, τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες.

[29] Ep. Synod. ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (ibid. p. 362. 1.) Ψαλμοὺς δὲ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν παύσας, ὡς δὴ νεωτέρους καὶ νεωτέρων ἀνδρῶν συγγράμματα, εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τοῦ Πάσχα ἡμέρᾳ, ψαλμῳδεῖν γυναῖκας παρασκευάζων· ὧν καὶ ἀκούσας ἄν τις φρίξειεν, κ.τ.λ.

hearer tremble.' And for this insolent attempt against the divinity and worship of Christ that heretical bishop was anathematized and deposed.

A little before this time, Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, composed psalms and hymns for the use of the Church, which are commended by Dionysius [30], bishop of Alexandria, as an useful work for the edification of the brethren. And probably they might be some of those hymns, which Paulus Samosatensis discarded as novel inventions of modern authors, though hymns of the like nature had been in use from the first foundation of the Church. Dionysius of Alexandria was one of those, who opposed the practice of Paulus Samosatensis by his letters, though he was not present in the Council; and he is commended by St. Basil [31] as one that always used this form of doxology: 'To God the Father, and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, be glory and dominion now and for ever, world without end. Amen.'

But we have more pregnant testimonies from the works of Origen in the beginning of this century. In his Fifth Book against Celsus [32], he tell us, that they could not lawfully worship angels, but they might and did worship the Son of God. 'All prayers,' says he, 'and supplications, and intercessions, and thanksgivings, are to be sent up to God, the Lord of all, by the High Priest, who is above all angels, being the living Word and God. And we can also pray to the Word himself, and make intercessions to him, and give thanks, and make supplications to him, if we rightly understand how prayer is to be taken in propriety of speech, or with some restriction.' He means, that prayers offered to the Son of God, considered as a son, redound to the Father, as the fountain of the Deity;

[30] De Promission. ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 24. (ibid. p. 350. 11.) .... *Ἐν ἄλλοις μὲν πολλοῖς ἀποδέχομαι καὶ ἀγαπῶ Νέπωτα, τῆς τε πίστεως καὶ τῆς φιλοπονίας, καὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς διατριβῆς, καὶ τῆς πολλῆς ψαλμῳδίας, ᾗ μέχρι νῦν πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐθυμοῦνται.*

[31] De Spir. Sanct. c. 29. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 84 e. n. 72.) *Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ [καὶ] Πατρὶ, καὶ Υἱῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.*

[32] P. 233. (t. 1. p. 580 a.) *Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων Ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου Λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ. Δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ [καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν], καὶ προσευξόμεθα δὲ, ἐὰν δυνώμεθα, κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως. Ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλέσαι .... οὐκ εὔλογον.*

as Bishop Bull[32] judiciously explains, and vindicates this passage from the unjust exceptions which Huetius makes against it. As he does also another passage in the Eighth Book[33],

[32] Defens. Fid. Nicæn. s. 2. c. 9. n. 15. p. 199. (p. 121.) Multis in locis clare fatetur Origenes, ipsi [Filio] propter inenarrabili præstantia præcellentem divinitatem, quam cum Patre communem habet, eundem plane divinum cultum, quem Patri exhibemus, omnino deberi: hoc est, oportere nos mente et conceptione nostra, (qua sola proprie Deum colimus,) easdem divinæ naturæ perfectiones omnes Filio adscribere, quas Patri tribuimus. Sin Filium intuemur relate, qua Filius est, et ex Deo Patre trahit originem, tum rursus certum est, cultum et venerationem omnem, quem ipsi deferimus, ad Patrem redundare, in ipsumque, ut *πηγὴν θεότητος*, ultimo referri.

[33] P. 385. (ibid. p. 750 d, seqq.) Celsi verba. *Εἰ μὲν δὴ μηδένα ἄλλον ἐθεράπευον οὗτοι, πλὴν ἕνα Θεὸν, ἦν ἄν τις αὐτοῖς ἴσως πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀτενὴς* [al. *ἀγενὴς*] *λόγος· νυνὶ δὲ τὸν ἔναγχος φανέντα τοῦτον ὑποθρησκεύουσι, καὶ ὅμως οὐδὲν πλημμελεῖν νομίζουσι περὶ τὸν Θεὸν, εἰ καὶ ὑπηρέτης αὐτοῦ θεραπευθήσεται.*

Origenis verba. *Λεκτέον δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι, εἴπερ νενοήκει ὁ Κέλσος τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν· καὶ τὸ ἐν εὐχῇ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ, Ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἕν ἐσμεν· οὐκ ἂν ᾤετο ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλον θεραπεύειν παρὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεόν. Ὁ γὰρ Πατὴρ, φησὶν, ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρί. Εἰ δέ τις ἐκ τούτων περισπασθήσεται, μή πη αὐτομολοῦμεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀναιροῦντας δύο εἶναι ὑποστάσεις, Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν, ἐπιστησάτω τῷ, Ἵν δὲ πάντων τῶν πιστευσάντων ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία, ἵνα θεωρήσῃ τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν. Ἕνα οὖν Θεὸν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν· καὶ μένει ἡμῖν ὁ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀτενὴς λόγος· καὶ οὐ τὸν ἔναγχός γε φανέντα, ὡς πρότερον οὐκ ὄντα, ὑπερθρησκεύομεν. Αὐτῷ γὰρ πειθόμεθα τῷ εἰπόντι, Πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι· καὶ λέγοντι, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια· καὶ οὐχ οὕτω τις ἡμῶν ἐστιν ἀνδράποδον, ὡς οἴεσθαι, ὅτι ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐσία πρὸ τῶν χρόνων τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιφανείας οὐκ ἦν. Θρησκεύομεν οὖν τὸν Πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* [al. *τῆς ἀληθείας*], *ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος· ὡς τὸν ἑωρακότα τὸν Υἱὸν, ὄντα ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἑωρακέναι ἐν αὐτῷ, ὄντι εἰκόνι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Θεόν. Εἶτ' οἴεται, ἐκ τοῦ θρησκεύειν ἡμᾶς μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀκολουθεῖν ἡμῖν τὸ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπηρέτας αὐτοῦ θεραπεύεσθαι. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐνόει τοὺς ἀληθῶς ὑπηρέτας τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Γαβριὴλ, καὶ τὸν Μιχαὴλ, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀγγέλους, καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους, καὶ τούτους ἔλεγε δεῖν θεραπεύεσθαι· ἴσως ἂν τὸ περὶ τοῦ θηραπεύειν αὐτοῦ σημαινόμενον ἐκκαθήραντες, καὶ τῶν τοῦ θεραπεύοντος πράξεων, εἴπομεν ἂν εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὡς περὶ τηλικούτων διαλεγόμενοι, ἅπερ ἐχωροῦμεν περὶ αὐτῶν νοῆσαι. Νυνὶ δὲ ὑπηρέτας νομίζων τοὺς προσκυνουμένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαίμονας, οὐχ ὑπάγει ἡμᾶς ἀκολουθίᾳ τῇ περὶ τοῦ θεραπεύειν τοὺς τοιούτους, οὓς ὑπηρέτας τοῦ πονηροῦ ὁ λόγος ἀποδείκνυσι, καὶ ἄρχοντας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, ἀφιστάντος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὓς ἂν δύνηται. Ὡς οὐχ ὑπηρέτας οὖν, οὓς οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι σέβουσι, πάντας σέβειν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἐκκλίνομεν· οὐκ ἂν γὰρ, ὑπηρέτας αὐτοὺς διδαχθέντες εἶναι τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεοῦ, ἐλέγομεν εἶναι δαιμόνια· διὸ* [al. *ἀλλὰ*] *τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν ἕνα Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Λόγον, καὶ εἰκόνα, ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν ἱκεσίαις καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβομεν, προσάγοντες τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς, διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ· ᾧ πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἱλασμὸν ὄντα περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, προσαγαγεῖν ὡς ἀρχιερέα τὰς* [al. *καὶ*] *εὐχὰς, καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τῷ*

where Origen more largely asserts the worship of Christ against the common objection renewed by Celsus, that the Christians worshipped one that had but lately appeared in the world. Celsus had thus formed the objection with all the art and force he was able: 'If the Christians,' says he, 'worshipped no other but One God, their arguments might be of some weight and force against others: but now they give immense honour and worship to this new upstart, who so lately made his appearance in the world, and yet think they commit no offence against God, though they give divine worship to his servant.' To this Origen replies, not by dissembling, or denying, or diminishing the worship of Christ, but by asserting it upon such grounds and principles as show that Father and Son can be but One God: and that to worship two persons under such relation and economy of real Father and Son, cannot be to worship two Gods. 'If Celsus,' says he, 'had understood the meaning of this, "I and the Father are One;" or what the Son of God says in his prayer, "As I and Thou are One," he would never have imagined, that we worship any but the God, who is over all. For he saith, "The Father is in me, and I in the Father." But that no one may think, that in saying this, we run over to those, who deny the Father and Son to be two Hypostases or persons, (meaning the Sabellians,) let him consider that which is said, "All they that believed were of one heart and one soul," that he may understand this, "I and the Father are One." We therefore worship One God, as I have showed, the Father and the Son; and our reasoning stands still in full force against others; neither do we give divine honour to an upstart being, as if he had no existence before. For we believe him, when he says, "Before Abraham was, I am;" and again, "I am the Truth." Neither is any of us of so mean and servile understanding as to imagine, that the substance of truth had not a being before the appearance of Christ in the flesh. Therefore we worship the Father of Truth, and the Son, who is the Truth, two things in personal

ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ. Περὶ τὸν Θεὸν οὖν ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν διὰ τοῦ ταύτην βεβαιοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἡμῶν ἔχει δεῖξαι στάσιν περὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Κέλσος. Καὶ σέβομέν γε τὸν Πατέρα, θαυμάζοντες αὐτοῦ τὸν Υἱὸν, Λόγον, καὶ Σοφίαν, καὶ Ἀλήθειαν, καὶ Δικαιοσύνην, καὶ πάντα, ἅπερ εἶναι μεμαθήκαμεν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸν γεννηθέντα ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου Πατρός.

subsistence, but one in agreement, and consent, and identity of will:—*ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος*:—so that whoever sees the Son, who is the brightness of the glory of God, and the express image of his Person, sees God in him, as being the true image of God. Now Celsus imagines, that because together with God we worship his Son, it follows upon our own principles, that we may not only worship God, but his ministers and servants. And indeed if he meant the true servants of God, after his only begotten Son, such as Michael and Gabriel, and the rest of the angels and archangels, and stood up for the worship of these; perhaps taking worship, and the acts of the worshippers in a sound and qualified sense, (he means the common respect of love and honour, which is due to good angels,) we might say something proper upon this head: but now when he understands by the servants of God, only the devils, whom the Gentiles worship, he does not oblige us by any just consequence to worship such as these, whom the Scripture assures us to be only servants of the wicked one, the prince of this world, and the author of apostasy from God. We refuse to worship all such, as knowing them to be no servants of God; for had they been servants, we should not have called them devils; but we worship One God, and his only Son, and Word, and Image, with supplications and prayers to the utmost of our power, offering our prayers to God over all by his only begotten Son; to whom we first present them, beseeching Him, who is the propitiation for our sins, as our High Priest, to offer our prayers, and sacrifices, and intercessions to God the Lord of all things. Therefore our faith relies only upon God, by his Son, who confirms it in us. And therefore Celsus has no reason or colour for his charge of sedition, or departing from God upon the account of his Son: for we worship the Father, whilst we admire and adore the Son, who is his Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, and whatever else we are taught to believe of the Son of God, begotten of such a Father.'

I have recited this passage at length, not only because it is such a full proof of the matter of fact, that the Christians did give divine honour and worship to the Son; but also because it shows us upon what principle and foundation they did it;

viz. as being the true Son of God, and One God with the Father. For though Huetius[33] has excepted against some words in this passage, as derogatory to the Son; and the modern Arians have abused it to patronise their heresy; and the Romanists would fain draw it into a proof for the worship of angels; yet I dare be bold to say, there is not a tittle in it, when rightly understood, to countenance any of their suggestions: but as it is a solid proof of the matter of fact, so it is an illustrious evidence of Origen's belief, and clear explication of the unity of the Godhead. For excepting that sort of unity which Origen and all Catholic writers reject as inconsistent with a real Trinity, that is, the unity of Hypostases, or Persons, which none but Sabellians and their followers maintain; he asserts all other kinds of unity, in opposition to Arians, who denied the unity of essence, or nature, and made the Son to be of a different substance from the Father, as a created being; in opposition to the Marcionites, and such other heretics, as maintained contrary principles, one good, and another evil, in the Godhead; in opposition to the Tritheites, who brought in the proper doctrine of three Gods, by denying the subordination and relation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and asserting three co-ordinate and independent principles, and baptizing 'in the name of three such *ἄναρχοι, ἀναίτιοι,* and *ἀγέννητοι,* (as the Apostolical Canons[34] call them,) *three unoriginated* and *unbegotten* principles, wholly *independent* of one another;' in opposition to Hieracas and the Triformians, who absurdly divided the Trinity into three parts of one whole; and finally in opposition to all that swarm of heretics, who distinguished with the Cerdonians between the God of Justice and the God of Goodness, styling the one the God of the Law and the Prophets, and the other the Father of Christ and God of the Gospel.

Origen, I say, in opposition to all these asserts every sort of unity, except the Jewish and Sabellian notion of unity, which confines the Divine Nature to one Person. For in saying,

[33] [Origeniana, ad calc. Oper. Origen. Paris. 1759. t. 4. pp. 79, seqq. Ed.]

[34] C. 49. [Labb. c. 48.] (Cotel. [c. 41.] v. 1. p. 444.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν, μὴ βαπτίσῃ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ εἰς τρεῖς Ἀνάρχους, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς Υἱοὺς, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς Παρακλήτους, καθαιρείσθω.*

1, that the Son is the express and true image of God the Father, he asserts the identity of nature, against Arius; and so could not believe him to be a creature of a different substance or nature, but as a true Son, of the same essence with his Father, and equal to him in all infinite and divine perfections. 2. In saying that he was a Son, deriving his original from the Father, and not another independent being, he maintains the unity of principle, and reserves to the Father the privilege of being the fountain of the Deity; and consequently opposes the heresy of the Tritheites, who maintain three coordinate and independent principles, and destroy the monarchy, and make three Creators instead of one, by destroying the due subordination and relation of the Son to the Father. 3. In saying, that the Father and Son are one in agreement, and consent, and identity of will, he asserts the unity of operation, creation, and government; which destroys the heresy of those who maintained contrary principles in the Godhead. 4. In saying, that the Son was equal to the Father in all infinite perfections, he rejects the absurdity of those who dreamed of three parts in the Divine Nature. 5. In asserting Christ to be the Son of the Creator, and God of the Old Testament, he maintains the unity of Providence, and refutes the heresy of those who maintained that the Creator and God of the Old Testament was a different God from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. So that he maintains all sorts of unity, except personal unity, which cannot consist with a real Trinity in the Godhead. And upon this foot he answers the objection of Celsus, who charged the Christians with polytheism for giving divine honour to Jesus Christ.

Having made this short and useful digression upon the celebrated passage of Origen, to vindicate it from the abuses of the modern Arians, I now return to the history of fact, to show that divine worship was given to Christ as the Son of God. And of this there is further evidence in Origen: for this is not the only place in which he is put to vindicate the worship of Christ from the charge of polytheism, which is frequently repeated by Celsus. In the Third Book[34] Celsus ob-

[34] P. 131. (t. 1. p. 469 a.) Μετὰ ταῦτα παραπλησίον ἡμᾶς οἴεται πεποιηκέναι, τὸν, ὥς φησιν ὁ Κέλσος, ἁλόντα καὶ ἀποθανόντα θρησκεύοντας, τοῖς Γέταις σέβουσι τὸν Ζάμολξιν, καὶ Κίλιξι τὸν Μόψον, καὶ Ἀκαρνᾶσι τὸν

jects, 'that they worshipped one, who was apprehended and put to death; in which respect they were no better than the Getæ, who worshipped Zamolxis, and the Cilicians Mopsus, and the Acarnanians Amphilochus, and the Thebans Amphiaraus, and the Lebadians Trophonius.' In replying to which Origen says, 'they offered their prayers to Christ, as Mediator between God and man, who conferred the blessings of the Father upon men, and presented their prayers as High Priest to the God over all.' Not long after Celsus repeats the charge again[35], 'that they, who ridiculed the Heathens for worshipping Jupiter, whose sepulchre the Cretians could show, did themselves worship one that was laid in the grave.' In the Seventh Book[36] he renews the impeachment three times, bidding the Christians 'not be so ridiculous, as to revile the Heathen gods as idols, whilst they worshipped a God of their own more wretched than any idol, and not so much as an idol, for that he was truly dead.' 'If they had a mind to innovate in worshipping a dead man, they might with more reason,' he thinks[37], 'have chosen Hercules, or Æsculapius, or Orpheus,

Ἀμφίλοχον, καὶ Θηβαίοις τὸν Ἀμφιάρεων, καὶ Λεβαδίοις τὸν Τροφώνιον . . . . τιμὴν μετ' εὐχῶν, ἃς προσάγομεν αὐτῷ· ὡς διὰ [al. δὴ] μεταξὺ ὄντος τῆς τοῦ Ἀγεννήτου καὶ τῆς τῶν γεννητῶν πάντων φύσεως· καὶ φέροντος μὲν ἡμῖν τὰς [ἀπὸ] τοῦ Πατρὸς εὐεργεσίας, διακομίζοντος δ' ἡμῶν τρόπον ἀρχιερέως τὰς εὐχὰς πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεόν.

[35] P. 136. (p. 475 a.) *Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει περὶ ἡμῶν, ὅτι καταγελῶμεν τῶν προσκυνούντων τὸν Δία, ἐπεὶ τάφος αὐτοῦ ἐν Κρήτῃ δείκνυται· καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον σέβομεν τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου, κ. τ. λ.*

[36] P. 358. (ibid. p. 719 c.). . . . *Ἵνα μὴ παντάπασιν ἦτε καταγέλαστοι, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους, τοὺς δεικνυμένους θεοὺς, ὡς εἴδωλα βλασφημοῦντες· τὸν δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς εἰδώλων ἀθλιώτερον, καὶ μηδὲ εἴδωλον ἔτι, ἀλλ' ὡς [al. ὄντως] νεκρὸν, σέβοντες.*

[37] Ibid. p. 368. (p. 732 c.) *Πόσῳ δ' ἦν ὑμῖν ἄμεινον, ἐπειδή γε καινοτομῆσαί τι ἐπεθυμήσατε, περὶ ἄλλον τινὰ τῶν γενναίως ἀποθανόντων, καὶ θεῖον μῦθον δέξασθαι δυναμένων, σπουδάσαι; φέρε, εἰ μὴ ἤρεσκεν Ἡρακλῆς, καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς, καὶ οἱ πάλαι δεδοξασμένοι, Ὀρφέα εἴχετε, ἄνδρα ὁμολογουμένως ὁσίῳ χρησάμενον πνεύματι, καὶ αὐτὸν βιαίως ἀποθανόντα· ἀλλ' ἴσως ὑπ' ἄλλων προείληπτο. Ἀνάξαρχον γοῦν, ὃς εἰς ὅλμον ἐμβληθεὶς, καὶ παρανομώτατα συντριβόμενος, εὖ μάλα κατεφρόνει τῆς κολάσεως, λέγων, Πτίσσε, πτίσσε τὸν Ἀναξάρχου θύλοκον, αὐτὸν γὰρ οὐ πτίσσεις· θείου τινὸς ὡς ἀληθῶς πνεύματος ἡ φωνή· ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτῳ φθάσαντές τινες ἠκοκούθησαν φυσικοί. Οὐκοῦν Ἐπίκτητον; ὃς, τοῦ δεσπότου στρεβλοῦντος αὐτοῦ τὸ σκέλος, ὑπομειδιῶν ἀνεκπλήκτως ἔλεγε, Κατάσσεις· καὶ, κατάξαντος, Οὐκ ἔλεγον, εἶπεν, ὅτι κατάξεις; Τί τοιοῦτον ὁ ὑμέτερος Θεὸς κολαζόμενος ἐφθέγξατο; Ὑμεῖς δὲ κἂν Σίβυλλαν, ᾗ χρῶνται τινες ὑμῶν, εἰκότως ἂν μᾶλλον προεστήσασθε ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖδα· νῦν δὲ παρεγγράφειν μὲν εἰς τὰ ἐκείνης πολλὰ καὶ βλάσφημα εἰκῆ δύνασθαι· τὸν δὲ βίῳ μὲν ἐπιρρητοτάτῳ, θανάτῳ δὲ οἰκτίστῳ χρησάμενον, Θεὸν τίθεσθε. Πόσῳ τοῦδε ἐπιτηδειότερος*

or Anaxarchus, or Epictetus, or Sibylla, rather than have made a God of one, who lived an infamous life, and died a miserable death. Yea, they might have chosen among their own prophets, Jonas under the gourd, or Daniel in the lion's den, as more worthy of this honour.' 'He, whom they worshipped,' he cries again[38], 'is no dæmon, but a dead man.' Thus from the charges of Celsus, and Origen's replies, we may collect what worship was given to Christ as the Son of God, and also as Mediator between God and men.

It is further observable, that Origen in his First Book[39], speaking of the wise men who came to worship Christ by the leading of a star, says, 'They offered gifts to him suited to his different qualities, who was compounded, as one might say, of God and mortal man: they therefore presented him with gold, as a king; with myrrh, as a mortal man that should die; and with frankincense, as a God.' And Origen himself in his other works frequently speaks of his own prayers offered to Christ. In one of his Homilies[40] he addresses him in these words: 'O Lord Jesus, grant that I may be found worthy to have some monument of me in thy tabernacle. I could wish to offer gold, or silver, or precious stones, with the princes of the people: but because these things are above me, let me at least be thought worthy to have goat's hair in the tabernacle of God, only that I may not in all things be found empty and unfruitful.' In another Homily[41], 'We must pray to the Lord

ἣν ὑμῖν Ἰωνᾶς ἐπὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ κήτους [al. *ἐπὶ τῇ κολοκύντῃ*], *ἢ Δανιὴλ ὁ ἐκ τῶν θηρίων, ἢ οἱ τῶνδε ἔτι τερατωδέστεροι;*

[38] Ibid. p. 376. (p. 742 a.).... *Αὐτοὶ διελέγχονται σαφῶς οὐ Θεὸν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δαίμονας, ἀλλὰ νεκρὸν σέβοντες.*

[39] P. 46. (p. 375 a.) *Φέροντες μὲν δῶρα, ἃ, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, συνθέτῳ τινὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ προσήνεγκαν σύμβολα μὲν, ὡς βασιλεῖ τὸν χρυσὸν, ὡς δὲ τεθνηξομένῳ τὴν σμύρναν, ὡς δὲ Θεῷ τὸν λιβανωτόν.*

[40] Hom. 13. in Exod. 25. [35, 5.] t. 1. p. 102. (t. 2. p. 176 d.) Domine Jesu, præsta mihi, ut aliquid monumenti habere merear in tabernaculo tuo. Ego optarem, si fieri posset, esse aliquid meum in illo auro, ex quo propitiatorium fabricatur, vel ex quo arca contegitur, vel ex quo candelabrum fit luminis et lucernæ. Aut si aurum non habeo, argentum saltem aliquid inveniar offerre, quod proficiat in columnas, vel in bases earum. Aut certe vel æris aliquid habere merear in tabernaculo, unde circuli fiant, et cætera, quæ sermo divinus describit. Utinam mihi esset possibile, unum esse ex principibus, et offerre gemmas ad ornamentum pontificis humeralis et logii. Sed quia hæc supra me sunt, certe vel pilos caprorum habere merear in tabernaculo Dei, tantum ne in omnibus jejunus et infœcundus inveniar.

[41] Hom. i. in Levit. p. 106. (ibid.

Jesus and the Holy Spirit, that he would take away that mist and darkness, which is contracted by the filth of our sins, and dims the sight of our souls.' And again[42], 'I must pray to the Lord Jesus, that when I seek he would grant me to find, and open to me when I knock.' And in another Homily[43], 'Let us pray from our hearts to the Word of God, who is the Only-begotten of the Father, that reveals him to whom he will, that he would vouchsafe to reveal these things unto us.' And he has many the like prayers in his other Discourses[44], but especially that passage in his Comment on the Epistle to the Romans[45] is most remarkable, where he proves Christ to be God, from his being called upon in prayer. 'The Apostle,' he says, 'in those words, (1 Cor. 1, 2.) "With all that call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," declares him to be God, whose name was called upon. And if to call upon the name of the Lord, and to adore God, be one and the self-same thing; then as Christ is called upon, so is he to be adored: and as we offer to God the Father first of all prayers, so must we also to the Lord Jesus Christ; and as we offer supplications to the Father, so do we also to the Son; and as we offer thanksgivings to

p. 185 c.) Ipse nobis Dominus, ipse Sanctus Spiritus deprecandus est, ut omnem nebulam, omnemque caliginem, quæ, peccatorum sordibus concreta, visum nostri cordis obscurat, auferre dignetur, &c.

42 Hom. 5. in Levit. p. 126. (ibid. p. 209 d.) Dominum meum Jesum invocare me oportet, ut quærentem me faciat invenire, et pulsanti aperiat, &c.

43 Hom. 26. in Num. p. 271. (ibid. p. 371 f.) Nos autem oremus ex corde Verbum Dei, qui est Unigenitus ejus, et qui revelat Patrem quibus vult, ut et nobis hæc revelare dignetur.

44 Hom. 3. in Ezek. p. 627. (t. 3. p. 366 f.) Præsta mihi, Christe, ut disrumpam cervicalia in animarum consuta luxuriam.—Conf. Hom. 32. in Ioan. p. 404. (t. 4. p. 404 a.) Utinam .... nobis adsit columna illa lucidæ nubis, Jesu, &c.

45 In Rom. 10. l. 8. p. 587. (ibid. p. 624 b.) Sed et [Apostolus] in principio Epistolæ, quam ad Corinthios scribit, ubi dicit, *Cum omnibus, qui invocant nomen Domini Jesu Christi, in omni loco ipsorum et nostro*, eum, cujus nomen invocatur, Dominum Jesum Christum esse pronuntiat. Si ergo et Enos, et Moyses, et Aaron, et Samuel, *invocabant Dominum, et ipse exaudiebat eos*, sine dubio Christum Jesum Dominum invocabant: et si invocare nomen Domini, et orare Dominum [al. Deum], unum atque idem est, sicut invocatur Deus, invocandus est Christus; et sicut oratur Deus, ita et orandus est et Christus; et sicut offerimus Deo Patri primo omnium orationes, ita et Domino Jesu Christo: et sicut offerimus postulationes Patri, ita offerimus postulationes et Filio; et sicut offerimus gratiarum actiones Deo, ita et gratias offerimus Salvatori. Unum namque utrique honorem deferendum, id est, Patri, et Filio, divinus edocet sermo, quum dicit, *Ut omnes honorificent Filium, sicut honorificant Patrem.*

God, so do we offer thanksgivings to our Saviour. For the Holy Scripture teaches us that the same honour is to be given to both, that is, to God the Father and the Son, when it says, "that they may honour the Son, as they honour the Father."' [Joh. 5, 23.]

Not long after Origen lived Novatian at Rome, and Cyprian at Carthage, who both speak of the prayers of the Church as offered up to Christ together with the Father.

Novatian[46] makes it an argument of his divinity, 'that he is present in all places to them that call upon him; which belongs not to the nature of man, but God.' And he argues further 'from the Church's praying to him as mediator; which kind of prayers would be of no use if he were a mere man: and from our obligations to fix our hope on him, which would be a curse rather than a blessing, if he were not God as well as man: for cursed is the hope that is placed only in man.'

St. Cyprian in like manner speaks of his being worshipped in many places. In his Book of the Advantage of Patience[47], he styles him 'the Lord God of Hosts, the God of the Christians:' and particularly tells us, 'that God the Father has commanded his Son to be worshipped; and in regard to that command, the Apostle Paul [Phil. 2, 9 and 10.] says, that "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth:" and in the Revelation, [22, 9.] when St. John would have worshipped the angel, the angel opposed it, and said, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren: *worship the Lord Jesus.*"' So

[46] De Trinit. c. 14. (ap. Galland. t. 3. p. 296 c.) Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in orationibus Mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præstandam salutem inefficax judicetur? Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur spes in illum ponitur, cum spes in homine maledicta referatur?

[47] De Bon. Patient. p. 220. (p. 151.) Dominus Deus virtutum prodibit et comminuet bellum .... Hic est Deus noster, id est, non omnium, sed fidelium et credentium Deus, qui cum in secundo adventu manifestus venerit, non silebit: nam cum in humilitate prius fuerit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. ... [Pater Deus præcepit Filium suum adorari, et Apostolus Paulus divini præcepti memor ponit et dicit, *Deus exaltavit eum, &c.* Et in Apocalypsi angelus Ioanni volenti adorare se resistit et dicit, *Vide ne feceris, &c. Jesum Dominum adora.* Ed.]

Cyprian reads it, *Jesum Dominum adora.* And he uses this as an argument to persuade men to patience[48], 'that the Lord Jesus, who is worshipped in heaven, bears with many indignities on earth, and does not avenge himself till his second coming in glory.' Again, in one of his Epistles[49], he speaks 'of their offering prayers to him as Mediator first, and then by him to God the Father; and that upon this double foundation, that he was their Advocate and Intercessor, and also their Lord and their God.' In another place[50], writing to Lucius, bishop of Rome, who had been a confessor for Christ, he tells him, 'they would not cease in their sacrifices and prayers to give thanks for him to God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, and also make supplications and prayers for him, that he, who was the author of all perfection, would keep and consummate in him the glorious crown of his confession.'

Not long after Cyprian, Arnobius wrote in vindication of the Christian worship; and here again he brings in the Heathens forming their usual charge against the worship of Christ. 'Our Gods,' say they[51], 'are not displeased with you for worshipping the Almighty God, but that ye make a God of one that was born a man, and put to death by the punishment of the cross, an infamous punishment, only inflicted on vile men, and because ye believe him to be yet alive, and make daily supplications unto him.' To this he answers, first upon their own principles, 'that admitting it were so, that Christ were only a man, yet he might with more reason deserve to be worshipped for

[48] [Ibid. (p. 152.) Qualis Dominus Jesus, et quanta patientia ejus, ut qui in cœlis adoratur, nec dum vindicetur in terris! Hujus patientiam, fratres dilectissimi, in persecutionibus et passionibus nostris cogitemus. *Grischov.*]

[49] Id. Ep. 8. [al. 11.] p. 25. (p. 186.) ... Primo ipsum Dominum rogare, tum deinde per ipsum Deo Patri satisfacere debemus. Habemus advocatum et deprecatorem pro peccatis nostris Jesum Christum Dominum et Deum nostrum.

[50] Ep. 58. [al. 61.] p. 145. (p. 273.) Vicarias pro nobis ego et collegæ et fraternitas omnis has ad vos literas mittimus, ... et, repræsentantes vobis per epistolam gaudium nostrum, fida obsequia caritatis expromimus; hic quoque in sacrificiis atque in orationibus nostris non cessantes Deo Patri, et Christo Filio ejus, Domino nostro, gratias agere, et orare pariter ac petere, ut, qui perfectus est atque perficiens, custodiat et perficiat in vobis confessionis vestræ gloriosam coronam.

[51] Cont. Gentes, l. 1. p. 30. (p. 19.) Sed non, inquitis, idcirco Dii vobis infesti sunt, quod Omnipotentem colatis Deum: sed quod hominem natum, et, quod personis infame est vilibus, crucis supplicio interemptum, et Deum fuisse contenditis, et superesse adhuc creditis, et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis.

his good deeds to mankind than either their Bacchus, or Ceres, or Æsculapius, or Minerva, or Triptolemus, or Hercules, because there was no comparison between their actions and his for the benefit of the world.' But, secondly, he answers[52] more closely upon true Christian principles, 'that the reason of their worshipping Christ was indeed their certain knowledge that he was the true God, whom they could not but worship and honour as the head of their body. And though an angry Heathen would rave at his being called God, yet they must answer plainly, that he was God, and God too of the interior powers of the soul;' that is, 'the searcher of the hearts and reins, which is the peculiar property of God.'

The same objection is once more proposed, and answered by Lactantius. 'They are wont,' says he[53], 'to object to us his passion, by way of reproach, that we worship a man, and one that was put to a notorious death by men.' In replying to which, after having largely set forth the reasons of his incarnation and sufferings, he at last answers that part of the objection which concerns their worshipping him, and pleads, that they worshipped him as one God with the Father. 'For,' says he[54], 'when we speak of God the Father and God the Son, we do not speak of diverse natures, or separate the one from the other; for neither can he be a Father without a Son, nor the Son be divided from the Father: for as much as he cannot be called a Father without a Son, nor the Son be begotten without a Father. Seeing therefore a Father makes a Son, and a Son makes a Father, they have both one mind, and one spirit, and one substance; but the Father as the fountain and ori-

[52] Ibid. p. 36. (p. 24.) Cum vero Deus sit re vera, et sine ullius rei dubitationis ambiguo, inficiaturos arbitramini nos esse, quam maxime illum a nobis coli, et præsidem nostri corporis nuncupari? Ergone, inquiet aliquis furens .... Deus ille est Christus? Deus, respondebimus, et interiorum potentiarum Deus.

[53] Instit. l. 4. c. 16. (t. 1. p. 314.) Venio nunc ad ipsam passionem, quæ velut opprobrium nobis objectari solet, quod et hominem, et ab hominibus insigni supplicio affectum et excruciatum colamus.

[54] Ibid. c. 29. (ubi supr. p. 351.) De mortalitate jam diximus, nunc de unitate doceamus. Cum dicimus Deum Patrem, et Deum Filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque secernimus: quia nec pater esse sine filio potest; nec filius a patre secerni; siquidem nec pater sine filio nuncupari, nec filius potest sine patre generari. Cum igitur et pater filium faciat, et filius fiat: una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia; sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus.

ginal, and the Son as the stream flowing from the fountain.' A little after[55] he explains their unity by this similitude: 'When any one hath a son, who is dearly beloved, as long as he is in his father's house and under his hand, although he allow him the name and power of lord, yet it is called but one house, and one lord. So this world is one house of God; and both the Son and the Father, who unanimously dwell therein, are but One God: because the one is as two, and the two as one;' meaning Two Persons, and One God.

Nothing can be plainer than these two things, from the words of Lactantius; first, that Christians gave divine worship to Christ: secondly, that they gave him this worship, as One God with the Father: and there was no other way to avoid the charge of polytheism, which they objected to the Heathens, and the Heathens were so desirous to recharge and throw back upon them.

There is one thing more may be observed as very remarkable in this age, which was an age of great persecution; that is, that the martyrs who suffered in it commonly directed their last prayers, as St. Stephen did, personally to Christ, in whose cause they laid down their lives, and into whose hands they resigned their spirit, commending their souls to him, as unto a faithful Creator and Redeemer. Thus Eusebius[56] observes of a whole city in Phrygia, in the time of the Diocletian persecution, that being all met together in the church, men, women, and children, magistrates, and people, (for the city was entirely Christian,) they were surprised by their enemies, and barbarously burnt all together in the church, as they were at their devotions, 'calling *upon Christ, the God over all,*—*τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους.*' So, in a former persecution in France under Antoninus, Blandina, one of the martyrs, when she was put into a net to be tossed by a wild bull, is

[55] Ibid. (p. 351.) Propiore exemplo uti libet. Cum quis habet filium, quem unice diligit, qui tamen sit in domo, et manu patris, licet ei nomen domini potestatemque concedat, civili tamen jure et domus una et unus dominus nominatur. Sed hic mundus una Dei domus est: et Filius ac Pater, qui unanimes incolunt mundum, Deus unus est: quia et unus est tanquam duo, et duo tanquam unus.

[56] L. 8. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 390. 17.) *Ἤδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὔτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὁπλῖται, πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες, κατέφλεξαν αὐτοὺς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους.*

said[57] 'not to have been sensible of any pain, *whilst she made her prayers to Christ,—διὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν.*' And Eusebius himself, who gives us these particular relations, makes a more general observation[58] concerning the worship of Christ, 'that the highest powers on earth confessed and adored him, not as a common king, made by men, but as the true Son of the Supreme God, as the true and very God; who had preserved his Church against all the opposition of so many fierce persecutions; there being nothing that was able to withstand the will of that Word[59], who was the universal King and Prince of all things and very God himself.'

We see in the opinion of Eusebius, the ground of their worship was no other than his being the living and true God, and the great King of all the earth. Which is the title that is given him in the Acts of St. Felix[60], an African bishop, who suffered in the Diocletian persecution: 'O Lord God of heaven and earth, Jesus Christ, I bow my neck to thee as a sacrifice, who livest to all eternity: to whom belong honour and power for ever and ever. Amen.' And in the Acts of Thelica[61], 'I give thanks to the God of all kingdoms. Lord Jesus Christ, we serve thee. Thou art our hope. Thou art the hope of Christians. Most Holy God, Most High God, God Almighty, we give thanks to thee for thy great name.' So again in the Acts of Emeritus[62]: 'I beseech thee, O Christ: I give thanks to thee: de-

[57] L. 5. c. 1. ex Ep. Eccles. Lugdun. et Vienn. p. 164. (ibid. p. 209. 30.) . . . *Εἰς γύργαθον βληθεῖσα ταύρῳ παρεβλήθη· καὶ ἱκανῶς ἀναβληθεῖσα πρὸς τοῦ ζώου, μηδὲ αἴσθησιν ἔτι τῶν συμβαινόντων ἔχουσα διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐποχὴν τῶν πεπιστευμένων καὶ ὁμιλίαν πρὸς Χριστὸν, ἐτύθη καὶ αὐτή.*

[58] L. 10. c. 4. (ibid. p. 468. 19.) *Ὥστε μόνον τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἡμῶν Σωτῆρα, καὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνωτάτω, οὐχ οἷα κοινὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων βασιλέα γενόμενον ὁμολογεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' οἷα τοῦ καθόλου Θεοῦ παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ αὐτοθεὸν προσκυνεῖσθαι.*

[59] Ibid. (p. 469. 11.) *Τί γὰρ καὶ ἔμελλε τοῦ Παμβασιλέως καὶ Παν-ηγεμόνος καὶ αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἐνστήσεσθαι τῷ νεύματι.*

[60] Ap. Baron. an. 302. n. 124. [al. 123.] (t. 2. p. 730 e.) Domine, Deus cœli et terræ, Jesu Christe, tibi cervicem meam ad victimam flecto, qui permanes in æternum, cui est claritas et magnificentia in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

[61] Ap. Baron. an. 303. n. 41. (p. 743 a.) Gratias ago Deo regnorum. . . . Domine Jesu Christe. . . tibi servimus. Tu es spes nostra. Tu es spes Christianorum. Deus Sanctissime, Deus Altissime, Deus Omnipotens, tibi laudes pro nomine tuo agimus.

[62] Ap. Baron. an. 303. nn. 49, 50. (p. 744 e.) Rogo Christe: tibi laudes: libera me Christe. In nomine tuo patior, breviter patior, libenter patior: Christe non confundar.

liver me, O Christ. In thy name I suffer, I suffer for a moment, I suffer willingly. Let me not be confounded, O Christ.' The curious reader may find many other prayers in the like terms in the Passions of Glycerius[63], Olympius[64], Ampelius[65], Euplius[66], Dativus[67], and Saturninus[68], Senior and Junior, recorded in Baronius, which I need not here transcribe.

I only add two further instances out of Eusebius and St. Ambrose. Eusebius[69], speaking of the passion of Porphyrius, a Palestine martyr, and one of the scholars of Pamphilus, says, 'when he was surrounded with flames, he called upon Jesus the Son of God to be his helper, and with those words he gave up the ghost.' And St. Ambrose[70] tells us, Vitalis the martyr made this his last prayer: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, my Saviour and my God, command that my spirit may be received; for I desire to obtain the crown which thy holy angel hath showed me!'

It were easy to add many other testimonies of the like nature, but these are abundantly sufficient to show what was the practice of the Church in reference to the worship of Christ during the three first ages, before Arianism appeared in the world, or any of those difficult questions were raised, which afterwards perplexed men with unintelligible subtleties, occasioned by the restless endeavours and sophistry of the Arian party. The Christians of the three first ages, we see, in their disputes with the Heathens, always with a great deal of honest plainness and simplicity freely owned, that they worshipped Christ as their Creator and their God; not as a creature, but as the true and living God; equal to the Father in all divine perfections, as a genuine Son; who, as a Son, could not be another God, but only one God with the Father. For they

[63] Ap. Baron. an. 301. n. 28. (p. 699 e.) Sum Christianus, servus Christi, qui solum verus Deus est, &c.

[64] Ap. Baron. an. 259. n. 30. (p. 532 a.) Gloria tibi Christe, &c.

[65] Ap. Baron. an. 303. n. 52. (p. 745 c.) Christe, tibi laudes refero, &c.

[66] Ibid. n. 148. (p. 768 c.) Gratias tibi Christe . . . adoro Christum, &c.

[67] Ibid. nn. 44, 45. (p. 743 d.) O Christe Domine non confundar . . . Rogo, Christe, &c.

[68] Ibid. n. 48. (p. 744 d.) Rogo te, Christe, exaudi, &c.—Ibid. n. 54. (p. 746 a.) Rogo, Christe, des sufferentiam, &c.

[69] De Martyr. Palæstin. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 431. 38.) . . . Τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰησοῦν βοηθὸν ἐπιβοώμενος.

[70] Exhort. ad Virgines. t. 1. p. 105. (t. 2. p. 279 a. n. 4.) . . . . Domine Jesu Christe, Salvator meus, et Deus meus, jube suscipi spiritum meum: quia jam desidero ut accipiam coronam, quam angelus tuus sanctus mihi ostendit.

declared, that so long as he was owned to be a true Son, he could neither be a creature, nor another God, which would imply another co-ordinate and independent being, which was inconsistent with his being the Son of God. They declared at the same time, that it was unlawful and idolatry to give divine worship to any creature, or any being, how excellent soever, that was not the living and true God; as we shall see more fully in the next chapter: and that is such a sensible and intelligible argument of their believing the Son to be the living and true God, as any one of the meanest capacity may understand: and it is such an argument of his divinity, as all the art and sophistry in the world cannot evade, without charging those holy men with the grossest idolatry and self-condemnation, and a flat contradiction of their principles in their practice, if they gave divine honour to One whom they did not believe to be by nature the living and true God. And for this reason I have insisted a little the longer upon this plain way of proving their belief of the divinity of our Blessed Lord, from their constant and universal practice in giving divine worship to him as their God. And as to those distinctions between *absolute, relative,* and *mediatorial worship;* or those of *latria, dulia,* and *hyperdulia,* (hard words invented to solve the idolatry of later ages,) whatever shelter modern idolaters may think to find in them, the Ancients had no occasion to lay the stress of their cause upon any such subtleties and distinctions. For they knew no distinction between *latria, dulia,* and *hyperdulia,* when they spake of religious worship, but plainly said all religious worship was solely due to God: and though they distinguished between absolute, relative, and mediatorial worship, yet they gave all these to the Son; worshipping him with mediatorial worship, as the only proper Mediator in both natures between God and man; beseeching him by his own merits, as their great High Priest, to present their prayers to the Father; and with relative worship, as the Son of God, whose honour redounds to the Father; and with absolute worship, as their Creator and Author of their being; declaring it to be idolatry to give any such honour to any mere creature. So that, either they believed Christ to be the living and true God, or else it is impossible to understand men by their words or practice.

Proofs of the worship of the Holy Ghost.

4. We are now to see whether they gave the same divine honour to the Holy Ghost. And for this the reader only needs to look back into the former proofs; for many of the preceding allegations join the Son and Holy Ghost together.

Polycarp's doxology[76] is to the whole Trinity: 'To Thee the Father, with him the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be glory now and for ever. Amen.'

Justin Martyr[77] declares also to the Heathen, that the object of their worship was the whole Trinity: 'We worship and adore the God of Righteousness, and his Son, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy.' And again[78], he proves that Christians were no atheists, as the Heathens objected, 'Because they worshipped the Creator of all things, and his Son Jesus Christ in the second place, and the Holy Spirit of prophecy in the third place:' only observing the natural order of the Persons, not distinguishing them into one God and two creatures; for then it had been unlawful to worship them upon their principles, which denied divine worship to any thing that by nature was not God.'

We have heard Lucian before[79] representing the Christian worship 'as the worship of the Great God of heaven, and the Son of the Father; and the Spirit proceeding from the Father, Three of One, and One of Three.'

Theophilus[80], bishop of Antioch, expressly mentions the Trinity under the title of 'the Father, his Word, and his Wisdom;' and says further[81], 'that it was his Word and his Wisdom to whom he said in the beginning, "Let us make man."' So that if the Holy Ghost was the Creator of man, there can be no dispute but that he was worshipped as his Creator together with the Father and Son.

We have heard Clemens Alexandrinus concluding his Pædagogue[82] with this doxology; 'To the Father and the Son, with the Holy Spirit, be glory now and for ever! Amen.'

We have heard St. Basil[83] testifying of Athenogenes the

[76] Polycarp. Martyr. ap. Cotel. t. 2. p. 199. See before, s. 2. n. 1, preceding.

[77] Apol. 2. p. 56. See ibid. n. 3, preceding.

[78] Ibid. p. 60. See ibid. n. 5, preceding.

[79] Philopatr. See ibid. n. 9, preceding.

[80] Ad Autolycum, l. 2. p. 106. See ibid. n. 14, preceding.

[81] See ibid. n. 15, preceding.

[82] L. 3. See ibid. n. 19, preceding.

[83] De Spir. Sanct. c. 29. See ibid. n. 21, preceding.

martyr, that he composed an hymn to the glory of the Holy Ghost; and that the Church, time out of mind, used that known doxology in her evening hymn at setting up lights; 'We laud the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God.' Which hymn was so ancient, that St. Basil professes he knew not who was the author of it. He testifies further in the same place, that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, was always wont to use this form of doxology; 'To God the Father, and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion now and for ever! Amen.'

We have heard Origen[84] saying, 'that we are to pray to the Lord, to the Holy Spirit; that he would vouchsafe to take away that mist and darkness which is contracted in our hearts by the defilement of sin, and dims the sight of our minds.' They that said such things as these did certainly own and practise the religious adoration and worship of the Holy Ghost. And all this we have seen proved in the former allegations. To which we may here add that plain testimony of Origen upon the first chapter to the Romans[85], where he compares the practice of the Heathens and Christians. 'It is the property of those only to dishonour their bodies,' says he, 'who serve idols; and of them only to worship the creature, who have forsaken the Creator. As for us, who worship and adore no creature, but the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, as we do not err in our worship, so neither let us offend in our actions and conversation: but, looking to what the Apostle says, "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" and again, "that your bodies are the temples of the

[84] Hom. 1. in Levit. p. 106. (t. 2. p. 185 c.) Ipse nobis Dominus, ipse Sanctus Spiritus deprecandus est, ut omnem nebulam, omnemque caliginem, quæ, peccatorum sordibus concreta, visum cordis nostri obscurat, auferre dignetur.

[85] In Rom. 1. l. 1. p. 468. (t. 4. p. 474 e.) .... Eorum ergo est contumelia afficere corpora sua, qui deserviunt simulacris; et eorum colere creaturam, qui reliquerint [al. dereliquerunt] Creatorem. Nos autem, qui nullam creaturam, sed Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, colimus et adoramus, sicut non eramus in cultu, ita nec in actibus quidem et conversatione peccemus, neque imitemur eos, qui contumeliis afficiunt corpora sua in semetipsis: sed aspicientes quod dicit Apostolus, *An nescitis, quia corpora nostra membra sunt Christi?* et iterum, *Quia corpus vestrum templum est Spiritus Sancti?* ut membra Christi et templum Spiritus Sancti corpora nostra in omni sanctitate et puritate servemus, quo non solum digna angelorum ingressibus fiant, verum etiam inhabitatione Spiritus Sancti, et mansione Patris et Filii.

Holy Ghost?" let us keep our bodies in all holiness and purity, as members of Christ, and as temples of the Holy Spirit.'

St. Basil[86], who wrote in defence of the worship of the Holy Ghost, cites another passage of Origen out of his Commentaries upon St. John, wherein he speaks of the worship of the whole Trinity in the celebration of baptism, saying, 'Baptism by virtue of the invocations there made, is the fountain and spring of spiritual graces to every one that dedicates himself to the divine Majesty of the adorable Trinity.' In which words Origen by *invocations* seems to refer to two things: first, the consecration of water to a mystical use, which was always performed by prayer, as I have showed at large in another place[87]; and, secondly, the form of baptism, which was always administered in the name of the Holy Trinity: in like manner as bread and wine in the eucharist was consecrated by invocation of the Three Divine Persons.

Which is expressly said by St. Cyril[88], 'that before invocation of the adorable Trinity it is common bread and wine, but after invocation it is made the body and blood of Christ.' Where he uses the same expression about the consecration of the eucharist, as Origen does about baptism, saying, that it was done by invocation of the adorable Trinity. And this is what Justin Martyr[89] means, when he says, 'that the minister in consecrating the eucharist sent up praise and glory to the Father of all by the name of his Son and Holy Spirit.'

Optatus[90] speaking of the sacrilege of the Donatists, says, 'they had broken down the altars, where God Almighty was wont to be invocated, and the Holy Ghost prayed to, that he might come down and sanctify the oblation.' Theophilus[91], of

[86] De Spir. Sanct. c. 29. ex Origen. in Ioan. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 85 d. n. 73.)... Τῷ ἐμπαρέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ Θεότητι τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος, διὰ τῆς δυναμέως τῶν ἐπικλησιῶν, χαρισμάτων ἀρχὴν ἔχει καὶ πήγην.

[87] B. 11. ch. 10. pp. 166–168.

[88] Catech. [19.] Mystog. 1. n. 4. [al. 7.] (p. 308 d.)... Πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἐπικλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος ἄρτος ἦν καὶ οἶνος λιτός· ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ.—Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 3. (p. 316 d.) Μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, κ. τ. λ.

[89] Apol. 2. (p. 97 d.)... Αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει.

[90] L. 6. p. 93. (p. 111.) Quid enim est tam sacrilegum, quam altaria Dei .... frangere,.... quo Deus Omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus?

[91] Ep. Paschal. i. [c. 13.] ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 3. p. 87. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 627 b.) Quod asserens non

Alexandria, says in like manner, 'that the bread and wine in the eucharist was consecrated by the invocation and descent of the Holy Ghost.' And we are told[92], that in the old Gallican Liturgy, the oblation prayer was conceived in this form: 'Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer unto thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension.' And, probably, Origen might have respect to some such invocation of the Holy Trinity in the consecration of the waters of baptism. However, the form of administering baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was ever esteemed an act of adoration of the Trinity, both as a profession of faith in Three Divine Persons, and as a dedication of the party to the service of the Holy Trinity, and as a solemn invocation of their benediction.

The ancient author of the Recognitions[93], who lived before Origen, says expressly, 'that baptism was anciently given by invocation of the name of the Blessed Trinity.' By which we can understand nothing but joining the Holy Ghost as God with the Father and the Son; in the same act of adoration, expressed either in the prayers or the form of baptism. And hence the Ancients[94] were used to prove the Holy Ghost to be

recogitat, aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari; panemque dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur, et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri, et sacrum calicem, quæ in mensa ecclesiæ collocantur, et utique inanima sunt, per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus sanctificari.

92 Micrologus de Observ. Eccles. c. xi. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 18. p. 474 h. 8) Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus in memoriam passionis, resurrectionis, ascensionis, &c.

93 L. 3. c. 67. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 531.) Baptizabitur autem unusquisque vestrum in aquis perennibus, nomine Trinæ Beatitudinis invocato super se.

94 Vid Idacium, l. 3. cont. Varimund. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 4. p. 301. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 5. p. 745 g. 5.) Ut in nomine Spiritus Sancti baptizetur, sicut in nomine Patris ac Filii, et Dominus in evangelio testis est, et Paulus paria pronuntiat, dicens: Dominus quidem, cum dicit, *Baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* Apostolus, cum omnes nos Spiritu baptizatos insinuat atque confirmat, *Etenim nos omnes,* ait, *in uno Spiritu baptizati sumus, sive Judæi, sive Græci, sive servi, sive liberi, et omnes in uno Spiritu potati sumus.* Et iterum: *In quo credentes signati estis in Spiritu Sancto promissionis, qui est pignus hæreditatis nostræ in redemptionem adoptionis, &c.* In iis igitur testimoniis unitas Trinitatis ostenditur, dum quod Pater vocatur, vel etiam operatur, hoc Filius et Spiritus Sanctus nuncupentur, vel eadem operentur.—[Conf. Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 29. (t. 3. part 1. p. 88 a. n. 75.) Ὅτι ἐνῆγεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Πνεύματος, πρῶτον μὲν ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τιμὴ, συμπαραλαβόντος ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα.

God, because he was joined in the same divine worship with the Father and the Son in the administration of baptism. And that baptism was generally esteemed null and void, which was given to any person without mentioning the Holy Ghost, as well as Father and Son, as I have fully showed in another [95] place.

It is further observable, that in Tertullian's time, the worship of the Holy Ghost was so common in the Church, that Praxeas and other Unitarians were ready to charge the Catholics with tritheism, or the worship of three Gods, upon this account. They boasted, 'that they were the only persons who truly worshipped one God, and preserved the divine monarchy entire; whilst all other Christians, by worshipping three Persons, introduced the worship of three Gods:' 'As if,' says Tertullian [96], 'the Unity absurdly collected might not make a heresy; and a Trinity rationally conceived might not consist with Unity.' He there [97] explains how 'these Three are one God by unity of original, by unity of substance, condition, and power.' And he adds [98], 'that as the Father was God, so the Son was God, and the Holy Ghost was God:' and says in another place [99], 'that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was a Trinity in one Godhead or Divine Nature.' So that it is plain, the difference then between the Praxean heretics and the Catholics was, that the Praxeans worshipped but one Person as God; but the Catholics worshipped three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, under the title and appellation of One God. And Erasmus was wonderfully mistaken, when he asserted [1], 'that

[95] B. xi. ch. 3. s. 2. pp. 27–30, of this volume.

[96] Cont. Prax. c. 3. (p. 502 a.) ... Duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero Unius Dei cultores præsumunt: quasi non et Unitas, irrationaliter collecta, hæresin faciat: et Trinitas, rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat.

[97] Ibid. c. 2. (p. 501 d.) Tres .... sunt unius substantiæ, et unus status, et unius potestatis: quia unus Deus, ex quo [Tres] in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur.

[98] Ibid. c. 13. (p. 507 b.) ... Et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus unusquisque.

[99] De Pudicit. c. 21. (p. 574 c.).. Trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.

[1] [As he did in the preface to his edition of the Works of Hilary of Poictiers, (Basil. 1523, ex Officina Frobeniana,) wherein he said, 'Nos huc audaciæ prorupimus, ut non vereamur Filio præscribere, quibus modis debuerit honorare matrem suam: audemus Spiritum Sanctum appellare *Deum*, quod veteres ausi non sunt.' See this and his answer in his *Apologia adversus Articulos aliquot per Monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos*, c. 2. object. 18.

the name, God, was never given to the Holy Ghost before the time of St. Hilary,' in the middle of the fourth century: when it is so evident he had both the name and worship of God given him in the time of Tertullian, and in effect by all Christians in former ages, whilst they joined him in all acts of divine worship and glorification with the Father and the Son, as one God.

Cyprian expressly styles him *God*, when, disputing against the validity of heretical baptism, he uses[1] this argument: 'If a man can be baptized by heretics, he may obtain remission of sins: if he may obtain remission of sins, he may be sanctified, and be made the temple of God. I ask, of what God? If it be said the Creator; he cannot be his temple, who believes not in him. If Christ; neither can he be his temple, who believes not Christ to be God. If the Holy Ghost; seeing the Three are One, how can the Holy Spirit be reconciled to him, who is an enemy to the Father or the Son?' As the Holy Ghost is here plainly styled *God*, so every true Christian is said to be "the temple of the Holy Ghost," as God: and temples being for the worship of God, it may be concluded, that, according to Cyprian, the Holy Ghost was then worshipped in all his living temples as God.

At the same time with Cyprian lived those two shining lights of the Asiatic Church, Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, and Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, surnamed Thaumaturgus from his power in working miracles. Of both these St. Basil[2] testifies, that in their prayers and books they were always wont to use this doxology, 'To God the Father and his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion for ever and ever!'

et respons. 18. (Oper. Lugd. Bat. 1706. t. 9. part 1. col. 1050 d. and 1051 c.) Non dubio quin omnibus, &c. Ed.]

[1] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 203. (p. 309.) Nam si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est. Quæro, Cujus Dei? Si Creatoris; non potuit qui in eum non credidit. Si Christi; nec hujus fieri potest templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti; cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus ei esse [esse ei] potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est?

[2] De Spir. Sanct. c. 29. (t. 3. part 1. p. 84 e. n. 72.) Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.—Ibid. (p. 87 b. n. 74.) Ἓν τοίνυν τῶν Γρηγορίου καὶ ὁ νῦν ἀντιλεγόμενος τρόπος τῆς δοξολογίας ἐστὶν, ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνου παραδόσεως τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένος. . . . Ταύτην καὶ Φιρμιλιανῷ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ μαρτυροῦσι τὴν πίστιν οἱ λόγοι, οὓς κατέλιπε [al. καταλελοιπε].

And this is the doxology that most commonly occurs in the Author of the Constitutions, which though I do not with a late author, [William Whiston in his Essay upon them,] take for an inspired writing, nor for the genuine work of Clemens Romanus, yet I believe it to be a very good collection of the Rituals and Liturgy of the ancient Church for the three first ages, and not infected with those pernicious principles of Arianism, which some would fain father upon him, who pervert his words, as they do the other Ante-Nicene writers, from their proper meaning to an heretical sense. This author, I say, commonly uses that doxology, which is so much commended by St. Basil, as expressing the true worship of the Holy Trinity.

Of which I shall give a few instances out of his Eighth Book, which is a Collection of the Forms of Prayer used in the ancient service. In the twelfth chapter of that Book[3] the oblation-prayer is thus concluded: 'We beseech thee to gather us into the kingdom of thy Christ, the God of the whole nature of things, both visible and invisible, and our King: for to thee belongs all glory, and worship, and thanksgiving, and honour, and adoration, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, throught all ages, world without end!' In the thirteenth chapter, the prayer after consecration ends in the same manner[4]: 'By thy Christ, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be glory, honour, and praise, doxology, and thanksgiving for ever and ever!' In the same chapter all the people sing this hymn to Christ[5]: 'There is One Holy, One Lord Jesus Christ, Blessed for ever, to the glory of God the Father! Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will towards men! Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed be God the Lord, who came in the name of the Lord, and was

[3] [Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 12. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 404.) Ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε . . . . . ὅπως ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς διατηρήσας ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ, ἐπισυναγάγῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσης αἰσθητῆς καὶ νοητῆς φύσεως, τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν, ἀτρέπτους, ἀμέμπτους, ἀνεγκλήτους· ὅτι σοι πᾶσα δόξα, σέβας, καὶ εὐχαριστία. Τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀνελλειπεῖς καὶ ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

[4] C. 13. (Cotel. ibid.) . . . . Διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεθ' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, αἶνος, δοξολογία, εὐχαριστία, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

[5] Ibid. (ut supr.) Εἷς Ἅγιος, εἷς Κύριος, εἷς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Ὡσαννὰ τῷ Υἱῷ Δαβίδ. Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, Θεὸς Κύριος· καὶ ἐπεφάνη ἡμῖν. Ὡσαννὰ ἐν ὑψίστοις. *Grischov.*]

manifested unto us! Hosanna in the highest!' In the fourteenth chapter[6], after the communion, the deacon says, 'Παραθώμεθα,—*Let us commend* ourselves to God, the only unbegotten God, and to his Christ.' Now the παραθέσεις, or *commendations*, were one sort of prayers, as I shall show hereafter[7]. Then the bishop makes a thanksgiving in the fifteenth chapter[8], which he concludes in these words: 'By Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be glory, honour, and adoration, now and for ever. Amen.' And in his invocation in the same chapter, he says[9], 'To thee and thy Son Jesus, thy Christ, our Lord and God and King, and to the Holy Ghost, be glory, praise, majesty, worship, and adoration, now and for ever, world without end. Amen.' There are many other such doxologies in other prayers throughout this Book[10], which I need not here repeat. For if these be not plain instances of the worship of the Holy Ghost, together with the Father and the Son, it is hard to say what words can express it.

In what sense all prayers are ordered to be directed to the Father.

5. Now then, by all this we may interpret the meaning of that African canon[11], which orders all prayers at the altar to be directed to the Father. For that was not intended to exclude the worship of the Son and Holy Ghost together with the Father; for the hymns and doxologies before mentioned, which were used at the altar, plainly show the contrary: but it was designed, that when the sacrifice of Christ was commemorated, he should be considered as the great Mediator, by whose sacrifice we apply to the Father, and have access by his merits and intercession to the throne of grace and mercy. And therefore all prayers at the altar are ordered to be directed to the Father in his name: which very application was a worship of the Son as Mediator, and an honour peculiar to him, and incommunicable to any creature. In other prayers direct ap-

[6] [C. 14. (Cotel. ibid. p. 405.) . . . Ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ μόνῳ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐτοῦ παραθώμεθα. *Grischov.*]

[7] B. 15. ch. 3. s. 29.

[8] [C. 15. (Cotel. ibid. p. 406.) Πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐπισυνάγωγε εἰς τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν· μεθ' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ σέβας, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

[9] Ibid. (ut supr.) . . . Ὅτι σοι δόξα, αἶνος, μεγαλοπρέπεια, σέβας, προσκύνησις, καὶ τῷ σῷ Παιδὶ Ἰησοῦ, τῷ Χριστῷ σοῦ, κ. τ. λ. *Grischov.*]

[10] Vid. l. 8. cc. 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 29, 37, 38, 39, 41.

[11] C. Carth. 3. c. 23. (t. 2. p. 1170 d.) Ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filio, vel Filium pro Patre nominet. Et, cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.

plications were made to the Son, as we have seen before[12] in that of the Constitutions for the dispossessing of devils: and in these prayers at the altar, the glorification was in common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Whence Fulgentius[13], who was an African bishop, and therefore may be presumed to understand the meaning of the African canons, tells us, 'that all worship and adoration of honour and sacrifice was equally given to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that is, to the Holy Trinity, by the Catholic Church; and that it was no prejudice to the Son or the Holy Ghost, that the minister at the altar directed the prayers to the Person of the Father. For in the end of them, the names of the Son and Holy Spirit were always expressed; and that showed, that there was no difference in the Holy Trinity: because when the words were only directed to the Person of the Father, yet the whole Trinity was honoured by the faith of the true believer; and whilst the intention of the sacrificer was more peculiarly fixed upon the Father, the sacrifice itself was by one and the same act offered to the whole Trinity.'

From all which it is evident to a demonstration, that the three Persons of the Holy Trinity were always the object of divine adoration from the first foundation of the Christian Church, and that the giving of divine honour to the Son and Holy Ghost, as God, was not the invention or addition of any later ages.

CHAP. III.

That in the ancient Church religious worship was given to no creature, saint, or angel, but to God alone.

This position proved, first, from their gene-

1. It has been observed in the foregoing chapter, that the worship of Christ in the primitive Church was esteemed a good argument of his divinity, because it was then an undoubted

[12] Ch. 2. s. 2. p. 295. n. 12.

[13] Ad Monimum, l. 2. c. 5. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 27 g. 1.) ..... Omne cujuslibet honorificentiæ et sacrificii salutaris obsequium, et Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, hoc est, Sanctæ Trinitati ab Ecclesia Catholica pariter exhiberi ..... Neque enim præjudicium Filio vel Sancto Spiritui comparatur, dum ad Patris personam precatio ab offerente dirigitur. Cujus consummatio dum Filii et Spiritus Sancti complectitur nomen, ostendit nullum esse in Trinitate discrimen. Quia dum ad solius Patris personam sermo dirigitur, bene credentis fide tota Trinitas honoratur: et, cum ad Patrem litantis destinatur intentio, sacrificii munus omni Trinitati uno eodemque offertur litantis officio.

principle, that no creature, how excellent soever, was to be worshipped with religious worship, but only the living and true God. And an Arian or a Socinian can never answer or evade this argument from antiquity, so long as both those assertions stand good, that Christ was worshipped with religious worship, and that nothing is to be worshipped with religious worship, but only the living and true God. The force of this argument has been much weakened and indeed wholly enervated and destroyed by the writers of the Romish Church, in whose mouths the argument signifies nothing to an Arian or Socinian, because their own practice, in giving religious worship to saints and angels, is a sufficient answer to it. For upon supposition, that saints and angels may be worshipped, the worship of Christ can be no argument of his divinity, no more than it is of the divinity of saints and angels, because they are worshipped in the Romish Church. But, upon the principles of the primitive Church, the argument is unanswerable: for at the same time that they asserted the worship of Christ, they asserted likewise, that religious worship was not to be given to any creature, but to God alone. And in this view, the argument for Christ's divinity was very rational and solid. As therefore we have seen the truth of the first position, that Christ was religiously worshipped in the primitive Church, made good from their undeniable assertions and practice: so now we will a little examine the truth of the second, that nothing is to be religiously worshipped but only the living and true God. Which position is designed to be handled here, only as an illustration and confirmation of the argument for the divinity of Christ, drawn from the practice of the primitive Church in giving religious adoration to him. And the truth of this proposition I shall confirm briefly these three ways. 1. By showing in general, that the Ancients declare universally against giving religious worship or adoration to any creature, or being, which by nature is not God. 2. That in particular they rejected the worship of saints and angels as idolatry and unlawful. 3. That there is no mention made of it but in the practice either of heretics, or Heathens, whose idolatry is aggravated upon the account of this practice.

ral declarations against giving religious worship to any creature.

In the first place it is observable, that the Ancients in general declare against giving religious worship to any creature, or

being, which by nature is not God. But it would fill a whole volume to cite all that is said by them upon this head, and therefore I shall content myself to select a few plain passages out of an infinite number that might be alleged to this purpose.

Justin Martyr often tells the Emperors in his Apology [14], 'that Christians could worship none but God alone: and that Christ had taught them so in saying, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," with all thy heart and with all thy strength, the Lord God that made thee: and again in saying, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." Therefore, we worship God alone, but in all other things we cheerfully serve you.'

In like manner Theophilus [15], bishop of Antioch: 'I will honour the king,' says he, 'not by worshipping him, but praying for him. But I will worship God, the living and true God, knowing that by him the king is ordained. You will say then, why do you not worship the king? Because he is not made to be worshipped, but to be honoured with lawful honour. For he is not a God, but a man. And as he will not suffer any other to assume the title of king but himself; so neither is it lawful to worship any other but God alone.' In another place [16], he says, 'God's laws forbid not only the worship of idols, but all other creatures, the sun, moon, and stars, heaven, earth, and sea; and command the worship of the true God alone, who is the Creator of all things.'

[14] Apol. 2. (p. 63 d.) *Ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, οὕτως ἔπεισεν εἰπὼν, Μεγίστη ἐντολή ἐστι, Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις, κ. τ. λ.*—Ibid. (p. 64 d.) *Θεὸν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν· ὑμῖν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπηρετοῦμεν.*

[15] Ad Autolycum, l. 1. p. 30. (ad calc. Just. Mart. p. 76 c.) *Τιμήσω τὸν βασιλέα, οὐ προσκυνῶν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ εὐχόμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Θεῷ δὲ τῷ ὄντως Θεῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ προσκυνῶ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γέγονεν. Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι, Διὰ τί οὐ προσκυνεῖς τὸν βασιλέα; Ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ τιμᾶσθαι τῇ νομίμῳ τιμῇ. Θεὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμένος, οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ δικαίως κρίνειν. Τρόπῳ γάρ τινι παρὰ Θεοῦ οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευται· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς, οὓς ἔχει ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν τεταγμένους, οὐ βούλεται βασιλεῖς καλεῖσθαι· τὸ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ὄνομα· καὶ οὐκ ἄλλῳ ἐξόν ἐστι τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι· οὕτως οὐδὲ προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῳ Θεῷ.*

[16] L. 2. p. 173. (ibid. p. 110 d.) *Ὁ μὲν θεῖος νόμος οὐ μόνον κωλύει τὸ εἰδώλοις προσκυνεῖν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις, ἡλίῳ, σελήνῃ, ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἄστροις· ἀλλ' οὔτε τῷ οὐρανῷ, οὔτε γῇ, οὔτε θαλάσσῃ, ἢ πηγαῖς, ἢ ποταμοῖς θρησκεύειν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῳ τῷ ὄντως Θεῷ, καὶ Ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων χρὴ λατρεύειν ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας καὶ εἰλικρινεῖ γνώμῃ.*

After the same manner, Tertullian[17] speaking of the Christians' prayers for the Emperors, and the peace of the world, says, 'They asked these things of the living and true God, and they could ask them of no other but him, of whom they were sure to obtain them, because he alone was able to give them.' And he repeats the same in several other places[18] of his writings.

This was the answer which the martyrs commonly gave to the persecuting judges, when they solicited them to worship other gods. When Fructuosus, a Spanish bishop, and martyr, who suffered at Tarragona, about the year 262, was commanded to sacrifice, he replied[19], 'I only worship one God, the Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things that are therein.' And so Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, answered Æmilian, the prefect, as he himself tells us in an Epistle, recorded by Eusebius[20]. 'I have publicly testified,' says he, 'that I worship none but the true God alone, neither can I ever depart from this practice, or cease to be a Christian.' And when Æmilian urged him further to worship the gods of the empire together with his own God, his answer was still the same, 'We worship him and no other.'

There are many the like expressions in Irenæus[21], Clemens Alexandrinus[22], Origen[23], Cyprian[24], Lactantius[25], the author

[17] Apol. c. 30. See before, ch. 2. s. 2. p. 298. n. 28.

[18] Scorpiac. c. 4. (p. 490 d.) Præscribitur mihi, ne quem alium ..... adorem, aut quoquo modo [al. quomodo] venerer, præter unicum illum, qui ita mandat.—Apol. c. 17. (p. 16 c.) Quod colimus [nos] Deus unus est, qui totam molem istam, cum omni instrumento elementorum, corporum, spirituum, verbo quo jussit, ratione qua disposuit, virtute qua potuit, de nihilo expressit.—Ad Scapul. c. 2. (p. 69 a.) Nos unum Deum colimus, quem omnes naturaliter nostis, &c.

[19] Act. Fruct. ap. Baron. an. 292. n. 62. (t. 2. p. 575 b.) Ego unum Deum colo, qui fecit cœlum et terram, et omnia quæ in eis sunt.

[20] L. 7. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 334. 31.) ...Ἄντικρυς διεμαρτυράμην, ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ὄντα μόνον, καὶ οὐδένα ἕτερον σέβων, οὐδ' ἂν μετατεθείμην, οὐδὲ παυσαίμην ποτὲ Χριστιανὸς ὤν..... Ἡμεῖς οὐδένα ἕτερον προσκυνοῦμεν.

[21] L. 5. c. 22. (p. 433. 30.) Sic igitur manifeste ostendente Domino, quoniam Dominus [al. Deus] verus et unus Deus, qui a lege declaratus fuerat (quem enim lex præconaverat Deum, hunc ostendit Patrem, cui et servire soli oportet discipulos Christi) et per eas, quæ sunt in lege, sententias adversarium nostrum evacuante, (Lex autem Demiurgum laudare Deum, et ipsi soli servire jubet nobis,) jam non oportet quærere alium Patrem, præter hunc, aut super hunc: quoniam unus Deus, qui justificat circumcisionem ex fide, et præputium per fidem, &c.

[22] Stromat. 6. (p. 825. 16.) Τοὺς Ἕλληνας χρὴ διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ἐκμανθάνειν ἕνα μόνον σέβειν Θεὸν, τὸν ὄντως ὄντα παντοκράτορα· ἔπειτα διὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου διδάσκεσθαι

of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanus[26], Athenagoras, Tatian, and others: which, because the learned reader may have recourse to himself, or read them collected together in one view in that excellent book of Mr. Daille[27] against the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, I shall here omit them, and proceed

Secondly, from their denying the worship of saints and angels in particular, and condemning it as idolatry.

2. To the second observation; which is, that the Ancients not only in general reject the worship of any creature, but reject the worship of saints and angels in particular, as idolatry and unlawful. And of this we cannot have a plainer proof, than was given in the answer of the Church of Smyrna to the suggestion of the Jews, when, at the martyrdom of Polycarp, the Jews desired the Heathen judge, that he would not permit the Christians to carry off the body of Polycarp, 'lest they should leave their crucified master, and begin to worship this man in his stead.' 'This suggestion,' says the

τοῦτο, Ἡμῖν δὲ οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, κ. τ. λ.

[23] Cont. Cels. l. 1. p. 10. (t. 1. p. 329 b.) Εἴπερ οὖν δεῖ πιστεύειν, ὡς ὁ λόγος ἐδίδαξεν, ἑνὶ τινὶ τῶν αἱρέσεις εἰσηγησαμένων ἐν Ἕλλησιν ἢ βαρβάροις· πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ διδάσκοντι τοῦτον μόνον δεῖν σέβειν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ, ἤτοι ὡς μὴ ὄντα, ἢ ὡς ὄντα μὲν καὶ τιμῆς ἄξια, οὐ μὲν καὶ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβασμοῦ, παροραῖν;—L. 8. p. 395. (ibid. p. 761 d.) Ἄπαγε δὴ τὴν τοῦ Κέλσου συμβουλὴν λέγοντος, Προσευκτέον εἶναι δαίμοσι· καὶ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν ἀκουστέον αὐτῆς. Μόνῳ γὰρ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, καὶ προσευκτέον γε τῷ Μονογενεῖ, καὶ Πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως, Λόγῳ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀξιωτέον αὐτὸν, ὡς ἀρχιερέα, τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσασαν ἡμῶν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ Πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατέρα τῶν βιούντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[24] Ep. 56. [al. 58.] (p. 257.) Sic et Daniel, quum compelleretur adorare idolum Bel, quem tunc populus et rex colebat, in asserendum Dei sui honorem plena fidei libertate prorupit, dicens, *Nihil colo ego, nisi Dominum Deum meum, qui condidit cœlum et terram.*—Ep. ad Demetrian. p. 187. (p. 130.) Utique quando ea fiunt, quæ iram Dei indignantis ostendunt, non propter nos fiunt, a quibus Deus colitur; sed delictis vestris et meritis irrogantur, a quibus [Deus] omnino nec quæritur nec timetur, nec relictis vanis superstitionibus religio vera cognoscitur; ut, qui Deus unus est, unus colatur ab omnibus et rogetur.

[25] Instit. l. 2. c. 1. (t. 1. p. 113.) De summa rerum sæpenumero cogitans admirari soleo, majestatem Dei singularis, quæ continet regitque omnia, in tantam venisse oblivionem, ut quæ sola coli debeat, sola potissimum negligatur, &c.—L. 4. c. 14. (ibid. p. 309.) Docuit [Christus] quod Deus unus sit, eumque solum coli oportere.

[26] L. 5. c. 16. (ap. Cotel. v. 1. p. 544.) Justum enim putant, non ea, quæ pro mundi ministerio facta sunt, sed ipsorum et mundi totius Creatorem debere venerari: gaudent enim etiam hæc, quum ille adoratur et colitur; nec libenter accipiunt, ut honor Creatoris creaturæ deferatur. Exceptus enim est Dei solius cultus, qui solus increatus est; omnia autem cætera factura ejus sunt.

[27] De Object. Cult. Relig. l. 1. cc. 2, 3, 4. (pp. 4, seqq.)

answer[28], 'proceeded purely from ignorance, that we could neither forsake Christ, nor worship any other. For we worship him as being the Son of God: but the martyrs, as the disciples and followers of the Lord, we love with a due affection, for their great love of their own King and Master; with whom we desire to be partners and fellow-disciples.' A like answer was given at the martyrdom of Fructuosus, in Spain. For when the judge asked Eulogius's deacon, whether he would not worship Fructuosus? as thinking, that he, who refused to worship the Heathen idols, might yet perhaps be inclined to worship a Christian martyr; to this Eulogius[29] plainly replied, 'I do not worship Fructuosus, but I worship him whom Fructuosus worships.' We are beholden to Baronius himself for this testimony: and we cannot desire a clearer evidence, that in those early times the Christians did not worship the martyrs, but only the God of the martyrs, to whom the martyrs offered their own bodies in sacrifice, whilst they died for his name, and sealed their confession with their blood.

Before this, Origen, in his answers to Celsus, positively denies that ever the Jews or Christians gave any religious worship to angels. He says[30], 'They are ministering spirits, that bring the gifts of God to us, but there is no command in Scripture to worship or adore them. For all prayers, sup-

[28] Smyrn. Eccles. Ep. ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 15. See before, ch. 2. s. 2. p. 292, the latter part of n. 2. *Τοῦτον μὲν Υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν· κ. τ. λ.*

[29] Act. Fructuosi, ap. Baron. an. 262. n. 62. (t. 2. p. 575 c.) Ego Fructuosum non colo, sed ipsum colo, quem et Fructuosus. [Conf. August. Serm. 101. de Divers. p. 571. [al. Serm. 273.] (t. 5. p. 1106 b.) Ego non colo Fructuosum, &c. Quomodo nos admonuit [Eulogius], ut martyres honoremus, et cum martyribus Deum colamus. Ed.]

[30] Cont. Cels. l. 5. p. 233. (t. 1. p. 579 e.) *Ὁμολογουμένως μὲν γὰρ ἀγγέλους φαμὲν λειτουργικὰ ὄντας πνεύματα, καὶ εἰς διακονίας ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν· ἀναβαίνειν μὲν προσάγοντας τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐντεύξεις, ἐν τοῖς καθαρωτάτοις τοῦ κόσμου χωρίοις ἐπουρανίοις, ἢ καὶ τοῖς τούτων καθαρωτέροις ὑπερουρανίοις· καταβαίνειν δ' αὖ ἐκεῖθεν, φέροντας ἑκάστῳ κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τι αὐτοῖς διακονεῖν τοῖς εὐεργετουμένοις προστασσομένων. Τούτους δὲ ἀγγέλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτῶν μεμαθηκότες καλεῖν εὑρίσκομεν αὐτούς, διὰ τὸ θείους εἶναι, καὶ θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ποτὲ ὀνομαζομένους γραφαῖς· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥστε προστάσσεσθαι ἡμῖν τοὺς διακονοῦντας, καὶ φέροντας ἡμῖν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων Ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου Λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ.*

plications, intercessions, and giving of thanks, are to be sent up to God by the great High-Priest, the living Word of God, who is superior to all angels.' He says again[31], 'Allowing what Celsus says to be true, that the angels were God's heralds and heavenly messengers: yet still the heralds and messengers were not to be worshipped, but he, whose heralds and messengers they were.' He repeats this frequently in his Eighth Book[32] in several places, which for brevity's sake I here omit, only reciting one passage more, because it so handsomely meets with that common pretence of the Romanists, that we are to worship angels, because they are the friends of God. 'We must endeavour,' says he[33], 'to please God alone, who is above all things, and labour to have him propitious unto us, procuring his good will, with piety and all kind of virtue. And if Celsus will yet have us to procure the good will of any others, after him that is God over all: let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the shadow follows its motion; so in like manner, when we have God, who is over all, favourable unto us, it follows, that we shall have all his friends, both angels, and souls, and spirits favourable unto us also. For they have a fellow-feeling with them, that are thought worthy to find favour from God. Neither are they only favourable to such as are thus worthy, but they labour with them also, that are willing to worship God over all, and

[31] Ibid. p. 239. (p. 587 a.)..... *Ἔστω καὶ κήρυκας αὐτοῦ εἶναι, καὶ ἀληθῶς οὐρανίους ἀγγέλους· πῶς οὖν οὐχὶ καὶ οὕτω τὸν κηρυσσόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν ἀγγελλόμενον μόνον μᾶλλον προσκυνητέον, ἢ τοὺς κήρυκας καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ;*

[32] Ibid. l. 8. p. 416. (p. 784 a.) *Κἂν ἴδωμεν δὲ μὴ δαίμονάς τινας, ἀγγέλους δὲ τεταγμένους ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς γῆς καρπῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν ζώων γενέσεως, εὐφημοῦμεν αὐτοὺς καὶ μακαρίζομεν, ἐγχειρισθέντας ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ χρήσιμα τῷ γένει ἡμῶν· οὐ μὴν τὴν ὀφειλομένην πρὸς Θεὸν τιμὴν τούτοις ἀπονέμομεν· οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦτο βούλεται, οὔτ' αὐτοὶ, οἱ τὰ τοιάδε ἐγκεχειρισμένοι.*

[33] Ibid. p. 420. (p. 789 d.) *Ἕνα οὖν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν ἡμῖν ἐξευμενιστέον, καὶ τοῦτον ἵλεω ἔχειν εὐκτέον, ἐξευμενιζόμενον εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς βούλεται μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξευμενίζεσθαι Θεόν· κατανοησάτω, ὅτι ὥσπερ τῷ κινουμένῳ σώματι ἀκολουθεῖ ἡ τῆς σκιᾶς αὐτοῦ κίνησις, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τῷ ἐξευμενίζεσθαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν, ἕπεται εὐμενεῖς ἔχειν πάντας τοὺς ἐκείνου φίλους ἀγγέλους, καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ πνεύματα· συναίσθονται γὰρ τῶν ἀξίων τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐμενισμοῦ· καὶ οὐ μόνον καὶ αὐτοὶ εὐμενεῖς τοῖς ἀξίοις γίνονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπράττουσι τοῖς βουλομένοις τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἐξευμενίζονται, καὶ συνεύχονται, καὶ συναξιοῦσιν. Ὥστε τολμᾷν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώποις, μετὰ προαιρέσεως προτιθεμένοις τὰ κρείττονα, εὐχομένοις τῷ Θεῷ, μύριαι ὅσαι ἄκλητοι συνεύχονται δυνάμεις ἱεραί.*

are friendly to them, and sympathize with them, and pray with them. So that we may be bold to say, that when men, who with resolution propose unto themselves the best things, do pray unto God, many thousands of the sacred powers pray together with them *unspoken to*, (ἄκλητοι,) without any invocation.'

A like answer is given to the same pretence by the author under the name of St. Ambrose. 'Men are wont,' says he[34], 'when they are ashamed of their neglecting of God, to use this miserable excuse,—That by these they might go to God, as by officers we go to the king.' To which he answers, 'Is any man so mad, or so unmindful of his salvation, as to give the king's honour to an officer; when if any shall be found but to treat of such a matter, they will be justly condemned as guilty of high treason? And yet these men think themselves not guilty, who give the honour of God's name to a creature, and, forsaking the Lord, adore their fellow-servants; as though there were any thing more that could be reserved to God. For therefore men go to the king by tribunes or officers, because the king is but a man, and knows not with whom he may entrust the affairs of the commonwealth. But to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid, for he knows the merits of all men, we have no need of an advocate or spokesman, but only a devout mind. For wheresoever such an one shall speak unto him, he will answer him.'

We have heard before out of Irenæus[35], that the Church in his time, though she wrought many miracles for the benefit of men, yet did nothing by invocation of angels, but only by prayer to God and the Lord Jesus Christ. And that thus it continued to be in the time of Athanasius, appears plainly from

[34] In Rom. 1, [22.] (t. 2. append. p. 33 a.) Solent tamen, pudorem passi neglecti Dei, misera uti excusatione, dicentes, per istos posse ire ad Deum, sicut per comites pervenitur ad regem. Age, numquid tam demens est aliquis, aut salutis suæ immemor, ut honorificentiam regis vindicet comiti; cum de hac re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur majestatis? Et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, et relicto Domino conservos adorant; quasi sit aliquid plus quod servetur [al. reservetur] Deo? Nam et ideo ad regem per tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nescit quibus debeat rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem, quem nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit, promerendum suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota.

[35] L. 2. c. 57. See before, ch. 2. s. 2. p. 295. n. 11.

his way of disputing with the Arians, when he proves the unity of the Father and Son from the Apostle's joining them together in prayer, (1 Thess. 3, 11.) "God himself and our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you." 'No man,' says he[36], 'would pray to receive any thing from the Father and the angels, or from any other of the creatures: neither would any man say, God and the angel gave me this.' And whereas the Arian might have said, that Jacob joined God and the angel together in prayer, (Gen. 48, 16.) Athanasius obviates this exception by saying, 'He did not join one of the created angels, who are angels by nature, with God who was their creator; neither did he, omitting God that fed him, desire a blessing from an angel upon his children: but in saying, "The angel which redeemed me from all evil," he showed that it was not any of the created angels, but the Word of God, whom he joined with the Father and prayed unto him.' There had been no force in this argument, had the Church used invocation of angels in her prayers in the time of Athanasius; the Arian might easily have replied, that his argument was refuted by experience in the Church's daily practice.

But that neither men nor angels were the object of religious adoration in his time, appears further from another Discourse of his against the Arians[37], where he argues thus: 'Peter the

[36] Athan. Orat. 4. [al. Orat. 3. n. 12.] cont. Arian. t. 1. p. 464. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 444 d.) *Οὐκ ἂν γοῦν εὔξαιτό τις λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἢ παρά τινος τῶν ἄλλων κτισμάτων· οὐδ' ἂν εἴποι τις, Δώῃ σοι ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος, ἀλλὰ παρὰ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, διὰ τὴν ἑνότητα καὶ τὴν ἑνοειδῆ δόσιν. . . . Εἰ δὲ ὁ πατριάρχης Ἰακὼβ, εὐλογῶν τοὺς ἐγγόνους Ἐφραὶμ καὶ Μανασσῆ, ἔλεγεν, Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τρέφων με ἐκ νεότητός μου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης· ὁ Ἄγγελος ὁ ῥυόμενός με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν, εὐλογήσαι τὰ παιδία ταῦτα· οὐ τῶν κτισθέντων καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀγγέλων ὄντων ἕνα συνῆπτε τῷ κτίσαντι αὐτοὺς Θεῷ· οὐδὲ, ἀφεὶς τὸν τρέφοντα αὐτὸν Θεὸν, παρ' ἀγγέλου τὴν εὐλογίαν ᾔτει τοῖς ἐγγόνοις· ἀλλ' εἰρηκὼς, Ὁ ῥυόμενός με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἔδειξε μὴ τῶν κτισθέντων τινὰ ἀγγέλων, ἀλλὰ τὸν Λόγον εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν τῷ Πατρὶ συνάπτων ηὔχετο, δι' οὗ καὶ οὖς, ἐὰν θέλῃ, ῥύεται ὁ Θεός.*

[37] Orat. 3. [al. Orat. 2. n. 23.] cont. Arian. p. 394. (ibid. p. 388 a.) *Πέτρος μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἀπόστολος προσκυνῆσαι θέλοντα τὸν Κορνήλιον κωλύει, λέγων, Ὅτι κἀγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι. Ἄγγελος δὲ θέλοντα προσκυνῆσαι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει κωλύει, λέγων, Ὅρα μή· σύνδουλός σου εἰμι, καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου, τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν τηρούντων τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον. Οὐκοῦν Θεοῦ ἐστι μόνου τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι. Καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασι καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι, ὅτι κἂν ἄλλων ταῖς δόξαις ὑπερέχωσιν· ἀλλὰ κτίσματα πάντες εἰσὶ, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶ τῶν προσκυνουμένων, ἀλλὰ τῶν προσκυνούντων τὸν Δεσπότην.*

Apostle did forbid Cornelius, when he would have worshipped him, saying, "I myself am also a man." (Acts 10, 26.) And the angel likewise did forbid John, when he would have worshipped him in the Revelations, saying, "See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them who keep the sayings of this book: worship God." (Rev. 22, 9.) Wherefore it belongs to God only to be worshipped. And this the angels very well know; that though they excel others in glory, yet they are all but creatures, and not in the number of those that are to be worshipped, but of those that worship the Lord.'

We cannot have clearer evidences than these, either of the Church's doctrine or practice: both which are equally attested by St. Austin in his Book of True Religion: where he makes it a distinguishing character and property of true religion to worship no sort of creature, particularly neither angels, nor saints after death, but the Sovereign Majesty of God alone. 'Let not our religion,' says he[37], 'consist in the worship of dead men: because, if they lived piously, they are not esteemed such as would desire that kind of honour; but would have him to be worshipped by us, by whose illumination they rejoice to have us partners with them in their merit. They are therefore to be honoured for imitation, not to be worshipped for religion.' A little after he says[38], 'That which the highest angel worships, the same is to be worshipped by the meanest man.' .... 'And this[39] we are to believe, that the very greatest of angels, and most excellent ministers of God, would have us worship One God with them.' .... 'And therefore we honour angels with love, not with religious service:

[37] De Ver. Relig. c. 55. t. 1. p. 317. (t. 1. p. 786 b.) Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum: quia si pie vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quærant honores: sed illum a nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur meriti sui nos esse consortes. Honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.

[38] Ibid. (f.) Quod colit summus angelus, id colendum est etiam ab homine ultimo.

[39] Ibid. (f 15.) Hoc etiam ipsos optimos angelos, et excellentissima Dei ministeria velle credamus, ut unum cum ipsis colamus Deum, cujus contemplatione beati sunt. Quare (p. 787 a.) honoramus eos caritate, non servitute. Nec eis templa construimus: nolunt enim se sic honorari a nobis, quia nos ipsos, cum boni sumus, templa summi Dei esse noverunt. Recte itaque scribitur, hominem ab angelo prohibitum ne se adoraret, sed unum Dominum, sub quo ei esset et ille conservus.

neither do we build temples to them; for they desire not to be so honoured by us; because they know, that we ourselves, when we are good, are the temples of the Most High God. And therefore it is well recorded, that the angel forbad the man to worship him, and bid him worship God, under whom he was his fellow-servant.' See Rev. 22, 9.

It is true indeed the Manichees about this time began to charge the Catholics with worshipping their martyrs: Faustus objected to them, 'that they had only exchanged the Heathen idols for martyrs, whom they worshipped with the same devotions, offering sacrifice of wine and meats to the ghosts and shades of dead men.' Had this been a true charge, though it could not have affected the argument, as drawn from the practice of the Church in former ages, yet it would have proved the corruption of saint-worship to have crept a little earlier into the Church than will now be allowed. But the truth of the matter is, it was a mere calumny of Faustus's own inventing: and St. Austin rejects it with the utmost scorn and indignation. Therefore he says, in answer[40] to it, 'That the Christian people did celebrate the memories of the martyrs with religious solemnity, both to excite themselves to their imitation, and to be partners in their merits, and to have the benefit of their prayers, yet so as that we never offer any sacrifice to a martyr, but to the God of martyrs, although we

[40] Cont. Faust. l. 20. c. 21. t. 6. p. 156. (t. 8. p. 347 b, c.) Populus autem Christianus memorias martyrum religiosa solemnitate concelebrat, et ad excitandam imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur: ita tamen ut nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum [sacrificemus; Ed. Lovan.] quamvis in memoriis [al. in memorias] martyrum constituamus altaria. Quis enim antistitum in locis sanctorum corporum assistens altari, aliquando dixit, Offerimus tibi, Petre, aut Paule, aut Cypriane? Sed quod offertur, offertur Deo, &c.... Colimus (d.) ergo martyres eo cultu dilectionis et societatis, quo et in hac vita coluntur sancti homines Dei, quorum cor ad talem pro evangelica veritate passionem paratum esse sentimus....At (d, e.) illo cultu, quæ Græce λατρεία dicitur, Latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quædam proprie Divinitati debita servitus, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus nisi unum Deum. Cum autem ad hunc cultum pertineat oblatio sacrificii, unde idololatria dicitur eorum, qui hoc etiam idolis exhibent; nullo modo tale aliquid offerimus, aut offerendum præcipimus, vel cuiquam martyri, vel cuiquam sanctæ animæ, vel cuiquam angelo; et, quisquis in hunc errorem delabitur, corripitur per sanam doctrinam, sive ut corrigatur, [sive ut condemnetur,]* sive ut caveatur.

* Ita legitur ap. Ed. Lovan., sed abest a MSS. Vid. Ed. Bened. in loc. Ed.

erect altars in the memories of the martyrs; (meaning churches called by their names.) For what priest, standing at the altar in the places where the holy bodies lie, ever said, We offer unto thee, Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian? But whatever is offered is offered unto God, that crowned the martyrs, at the memories of those whom he crowned, that by the very admonition of the places our affection may rise higher, to quicken our love both toward them, whom we may imitate, and toward him, who enables us to imitate them. Therefore we worship the martyrs with that worship of love and society wherewith we worship holy men of God in this life, whose heart we perceive to be prepared to suffer in like manner for the Gospel truth. But with that worship which the Greeks call *latria*, and the Latins cannot express by one word, being a service proper to God, we neither worship, nor teach any one to worship any other but God alone. And whereas the offering of sacrifice appertains to this kind of worship, whence it is called idolatry in those that give it to idols; we neither offer, nor teach any to offer such worship, either to any martyr, or any holy soul, or any angel; but whoever falls into this error is rebuked by sound doctrine, either to correct him, or condemn him, or to make him be avoided by others.'

It is plain from this answer of St. Austin's, that the charge of giving religious worship to saints and angels was false, and a mere calumny upon the Church in those days; and that the only persons then guilty of it were such as were disowned and discarded by the Church. Which brings me to the third and last consideration proposed to confirm this position, that the ancient Church did not give religious worship either to saints or angels, because she condemned the practice both in Heathens and heretics, and aggravated their idolatry upon this account.

3. St. Austin in another place[41] makes a severe remark upon all such as sought to angels by prayer for their assistance: he

Thirdly, from their charging

[41] Confess. l. 10. c. 42. (t. 1. p. 193 f.) Quem invenirem, qui me reconciliaret tibi? An eundum [al. ambiendum] mihi fuit ad angelos? Qua prece? Quibus sacramentis? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per seipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt hæc; et inciderunt in desiderium curiosaram visionum, et digni habiti sunt illusionibus.

the practice of it upon heretics and Heathens only.

says, they were distracted with strange curiosities and illusions. Take it in his own words, as he delivers it in a pious reflection upon his own happiness in escaping the snare at his own conversion, and a thankful acknowledgment of God's mercy in delivering him from such a delusion. 'Whom,' says he, 'should I have found, that might reconcile me unto thee? Should I have gone unto the angels? With what prayer? With what sacraments? Many, endeavouring to return unto thee, and not being able to do it by themselves, as I hear, have tried these things; and have fallen into the desire of curious visions, and were accounted worthy of illusions.'

St. Chrysostom[42] has a more severe reflection on this sort of men: for he not only says, 'that no creature is to be worshipped by man, neither of things above, nor things below, whether man or demons, or angels, or archangels, or any other supernal powers, but only God the Lord of all:' and that the Apostle in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Colossians[43] discourses against 'such as taught that man was to come to God by angels, and not by Christ; for that was too great for him.' But he adds[44], in pursuance of the same matter, 'that it was the Devil which introduced this having recourse to angels, whilst he envied the honour of man. These be the enchantments of devils. Though it be an angel, though an archangel, though they be cherubims, endure it not. For neither will these powers themselves receive it, but reject it, when they see their Lord dishonoured. I have honoured thee, saith God, and bid thee call upon me. And dost thou then dishonour him?' Where we see plainly, that invocation of God and invocation of angels are opposed to one another; and as the one is made

[42] Hom. 5. in Col. p. 1348. (t. 11. p. 358 f.) . . . Ὅτι οὐ λίθοι, οὐ ζῶα, οὐ φυτὰ, οὐ στοιχεῖα, οὐ τὰ ἄνω, οὐ τὰ κάτω, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οὐ δαίμονες, οὐκ ἄγγελοι, οὐκ ἀρχάγγελοι, οὐχ' ἑτέρα τις τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἐκείνων ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως θεραπεύεσθαι ὀφείλει . . . ὅτι ὁ πάντων Δεσπότης οὗτος Θεός ἐστιν, ὅτι θεραπεύειν αὐτὸν μόνον χρή.

[43] Hom. 7. in Col. p. 1360. (ibid. p. 372 a.) Ἦσάν τινες οἱ λέγοντες, οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσάγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων· ἐκεῖνο γὰρ μεῖζόν ἐστι, ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς.

[44] Hom. 9. in Col. p. 1381. (ibid. p. 394 f.) Διὰ ταῦτα ὁ Διάβολος τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπεισήγαγε, βασκαίνων ἡμῖν τῆς τιμῆς· τῶν δαιμόνων τοιαῦται αἱ ἐπῳδαί. Κἂν ἄγγελος ᾖ, κἂν ἀρχάγγελος, κἂν τὰ χερουβὶμ, μὴ ἀνέχου· ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ αὗται αἱ δυνάμεις καταδέξονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποσείσονται, ὅταν ἴδωσι τὸν Δεσπότην ἀτιμαζόμενον. Ἐγώ σε ἐτίμησά, φησι, καὶ εἶπον, ἐμὲ κάλει· καὶ σὺ ἀτιμάζεις αὐτόν;

the character of true religion, so the other is said to be the doctrine of devils.

The persons here reflected on by Chrysostom were probably the same as had been known in the Church, and condemned from the Apostles' days as heretics, under the name of *angelici*, or *angel-worshippers*. For so St. Austin[45] describes them, calling them *angelici*, from their inclination to worship angels. And so Isidore[46] after him. Irenæus[47] seems to insinuate that heretics were wont to invocate angels, when he opposes the Church's practice to them, telling them 'that many miracles were wrought in the Church, not by invocation of angels, but by prayer to God and the Lord Jesus Christ.' And Tertullian[48] says expressly of the followers of Simon Magus, 'that they worshipped angels in the exercise of their magical art, which idolatry was condemned by St. Peter in their first founder.'

Now there being such footsteps of angel-worship in the practice of so many heresies; and it being a thing that some were fond of, because it had a show of humility in it; the Council of Laodicea, to prevent the growing malady, made a severe canon[49], under the denunciation of *anathema*, to restrain it. 'Christians,' say they, 'ought not to forsake the Church of God, and go aside, and hold conventicles, to invocate or call upon the names of angels. Which things are forbidden. If any one therefore be found to exercise himself in this private idolatry, let him be accursed: because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and gone over to idolatry.' The first publishers of this canon in the Latin editions[50]

[45] De Hæres. c. 39. (t. 8. p. 11 e.) Angelici, in angelorum cultu inclinati, &c.

[46] Origin. l. 8. c. 5. (p. 65 f.) Angelici vocati, quia angelos colunt.

[47] L. 2. c. 57. See before. ch. 2. s. 2. p. 295. n. 11.

[48] De Præscript. c. 33. (p. 214 b.) Simonianæ autem magiæ disciplina angelis serviens, utique et ipsa inter idololatrias deputabatur, et a Petro Apostolo in ipso Simone damnabatur.

[49] C. 35. (t. 1. p. 1504 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι, καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν, καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν· ἅπερ ἀπηγόρευται. Εἴ τις οὖν εὑρεθῇ ταύτῃ τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ σχολάζων, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ προσῆλθεν.

[50] [Crabbe (Colon. Agripp. 1551. t. 1. p. 379.) gives the version of Dionysius Exiguus with *angelos* in the text and *angulos* in the margin: while Mercator reads *angelos idololatriæ*.—In Merlin's edition (Colon. 1530. t. 1. fol. 68.) the canon reads thus: Non oportet Christianos derelicta ecclesia Dei abire ad angulos, idololatriæque abominandæ congregationes facere, &c.—Caranza

changed the word *angelos* into *angulos, corners* instead of *angels:* but the Greek admits of no such corruptions, and therefore the fraud is easily discovered; and nothing but the shame of seeing their practice so plainly condemned in this canon could have induced any men to have attempted such a childish corruption.

Theodoret, in his Comment upon the Epistle to the Colossians, has occasion twice to mention this canon. Where[50] he says, 'that because some in the Apostles' days commanded men to worship angels, therefore the Apostle enjoined the contrary, that they should adorn their words and deeds with the commemoration of the Lord Christ, and send up thanksgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by the angels:' and 'that the synod of Laodicea following this rule, and desiring to heal that old disease, made a law that men should not pray to angels, nor forsake our Lord Jesus Christ.' And again[51]: 'This vice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long time, for which cause also the synod assembled in Laodicea, the chief city in Phrygia, made a law to prohibit praying to angels. But yet even to this day among them and their neighbours there are oratories of St. Michael to be seen.' Cardinal Perron uses a great deal of art and sophistry to pervert the sense of the Apostle and this canon together, which the reader may find sufficiently exposed and refuted by the learned Daille[52], with the false glosses of Petavius and others, with which I shall not trouble this discourse.

I only observe further, that as the Church condemned heretics as guilty of idolatry for worshipping of angels, so did she

(Summ. Concil. Lovan. 1681. p. 79.) gives the title of the canon, *De his qui angelos colunt,* but he retains *angulos idololatriæ* in the text. Ed.]

[50] In Col. 3, 17. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 496.) Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τοὺς ἀγγέλους σέβειν ἐκέλευον, αὐτὸς τὸ ἐναντίον παρεγγυᾷ, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰ ἔργα κοσμῆσαι τῇ μνήμῃ τοῦ Δεσπότου Χριστοῦ· καὶ τῷ Θεῷ δὲ καὶ Πατρὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν δι' αὐτοῦ, φησιν, ἀναπέμπετε, μὴ διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων. Τούτῳ ἑπομένη τῷ νόμῳ καὶ ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ σύνοδος, καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκεῖνο πάθος θεραπεῦσαι βουλομένη, ἐνομοθέτησε μὴ εὔχεσθαι ἀγγέλοις, μηδὲ καταλιμπάνειν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

[51] In Col. 2, 18. (ibid. p. 490.) Ἔμεινε δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Πισιδίᾳ μεχρὶ πολλοῦ· οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ συνελθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας νόμῳ κεκώλυκε τὸ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι· καὶ μέχρι δὲ τοῦ νῦν εὐκτήρια τοῦ ἁγίου Μιχαὴλ παρ' ἐκείνοις καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις ἐκείνων ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν.

[52] De Object. Cult. Relig. l. 3. c. 31. (p. 529.) Unus ex novissimis Perronius, &c.

likewise for worshipping of their leaders and martyrs. Apollonius[53], who wrote against the Montanists, objects it to them, 'that they worshipped one Alexander, a martyr among them.' And St. Austin[54] reckons it among the errors of Simon Magus, 'that he left his own image, and the image of his harlot Selene, [or Helene,] to his disciples, to be worshipped by them.' They objected the same to the Heathen, that they worshipped such gods as were only men, and dead men: as may be seen in all the Apologies made by Minucius Felix[55], Tertullian[56], Clemens Alexandrinus[57], Arnobius[58], Cyprian[59], and the rest that wrote

[53] Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 18. (v. 1. p. 234. 29.) *Ἵνα δὲ μὴ περὶ πλειόνων λέγωμεν, ἡ προφῆτις ἡμῖν εἰπάτω τὰ κατὰ Ἀλέξανδρον, τὸν λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν μάρτυρα, ᾧ συνεστίαται· ᾧ προσκυνοῦσι καὶ αὐτῷ πολλοί.*

[54] De Hæres. c. 1. (t. 8. p. 6 b.) Jovem se credi volebat, Minervam vero meretricem quandam Selenen [al. Helenen], quam sibi sociam scelerum fecerat, imaginesque et suam et ejusdem meretricis discipulis suis præbebat adorandas.

[55] Octav. p. 88. (p. 113. c. 22.) Saturnum principem hujus generis et examinis omnes scriptores vetustatis, Græci Romanique, hominem prodiderunt. Scit hoc Nepos, et Cassius in historia: et Thallus ac Diodorus hoc loquuntur. Is itaque Saturnus Creta profugus . . . homo igitur utique, qui fugit; homo utique, qui latuit, et pater hominis, et natus ex homine.—Ibid. (p. 116. cap. 23.) Post mortem deos fingitis; et, pejerante Proculo, deus Romulus: et Juba, Mauris volentibus, deus est; et divi, cæteri reges qui consecrantur, non ad fidem numinis, sed ad honorem emeritæ potestatis. Invitis his denique hoc nomen ascribitur: optant in homine perseverare: fieri se deos metuunt; et, si jam senes, nolunt. . . .Manifestum est, homines illos fuisse, quos et natos legimus, et mortuos scimus. Quis ergo dubitat horum imagines consecratas vulgus orare, et publice colere; dum opinio et mens imperitorum artis concinnitate decipitur, auri fulgore præstringitur, argenti nitore et candore eboris hebetatur?

[56] Apol. c. 10. (p. 11 a.) Appellamus et provocamus a vobis ad conscientiam vestram: illa nos judicet, illa nos damnet, si poterit negare omnes istos deos vestros homines fuisse.—Ibid. c. 13. (p. 14 a.) Sed digne imperatoribus defunctis honorem divinitatis dicatis, quibus et viventibus eum addicitis: accepto ferent dii vestri, immo gratulabuntur, quod pares eis fiant Domini sui.

[57] Protreptic. (p. 26. 9.) *Φιλόχορος δὲ, ἐν Τήνῳ Ποσειδῶνά φησι τιμᾶσθαι ἰατρόν· Κρόνον δὲ ἐπικεῖσθαι Σικελίᾳ, καὶ ἐνταῦθα αὐτὸν τετάφθαι. . . Ἀνθρώπω τινὲ τὼ Διοσκούρω ἐπικήρω γενέσθην· εἴτῳ ἱκανὸς πιστώσασθαι Ὅμηρος τὸ λελεγμένον·*

——Τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα
Ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι, φίλῃ ἐνὶ πατρίδι γαίῃ.

. . Ἡρακλέα καὶ αὐτὸς Ὅμηρος θνητὸν οἶδεν ἄνθρωπον, κ. τ. λ.

[58] Cont. Gent. l. 1. p. 32. (p. 23.) Et tamen, o isti! qui hominem, nos colere morte functum ignominiosa ridetis? Nonne Liberum et vos patrem membratim ab Titanis discerptum fanorum consecratione mactatis? Nonne Æsculapium, medicaminum repertorem, post pœnas et supplicia fulminis, custodem nuncupavistis et præsidem sanitatis, valetudinis, et salutis? Nonne ipsum Herculem magnum sacrificiis, hostiis, et thure invitatis incenso, quem ipsi vos fertis vivum arsisse post pœnas, et concrematum in funestis busticetis? . . . . Nonne ipsum Romulum patrem, senatorum manibus dilaceratum centum, et Quiri-

against them: which had been a very weak argument, and easily retorted, had Christians worshipped their martyrs, whom they could not deny to be mortal men.

The Heathens further pretended that their demons or gods, whom they worshipped, were good angels, and worshipped only as the ministers of the Supreme God, and attendants of the court of heaven. Notwithstanding which pretence, they charge them with idolatry, as giving the worship of God to the creature. He that would see this argument managed to just advantage, may consult the learned discourses of Mr. Daille[60] and Bishop Stillingfleet[61], where he will find the pretences of the Heathen, and the answers of the Christians, collected and set in their proper light. I shall only detain my reader with one citation out of St. Austin, as a specimen of all the rest, where[62] he introduces the Heathen making this apology for themselves; 'We do not worship wicked devils, say they; it is the angels you speak of that we worship, the powers of the Great God, the ministers of the Great God.' To which St. Austin answers; 'I wish you would worship them, for they would quickly teach you that they are not to be worshipped. Hear the instruction of an angel. He taught a certain disciple of Christ, and showed him many miracles in the Revelations of St. John. Who having seen a certain miracle in a vision, was astonished, and cast himself down at the feet of the angel. But

num esse Martium dicitis, et sacerdotibus et pulvinaribus honoratis, et in ædibus adoratis amplissimis, et post hæc omnia cœlum ascendisse juratis? &c.

[59] De Idol. Vanitat. p. 11. (p. 8.) Deos non esse, quos colit vulgus, hinc notum est. Reges olim fuerunt, qui ob regalem memoriam coli apud suos postmodum etiam in morte cœperunt.

[60] De Object. Cult. Relig. l. 3. c. 25. (pp. 491, seqq.) Sed nunc veterum, &c.

[61] Defence of the Discourse of Idolatry, part 1. ch. 1. s. 1. (Works, v. 5. after p. 262. Of the Treatise, p. 2.) As to the Heathens, &c.

[62] In Ps. 96. t. 8. p. 445. (t. 4. p. 1049 a, b.) Non colimus mala dæmonia: angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus, virtutes Dei Magni, et ministeria Dei Magni. Utinam ipsos colere velletis, facile ab ipsis disceretis non illos colere. Audite angelum doctorem. Docebat quendam discipulum Christi et ostendebat illi multa miracula in Apocalypsi Ioannis. Ille autem quodam sibi demonstrato miraculo visionis expavit, et misit se ad pedes angeli. Et ille angelus, qui non quærebat nisi gloriam Domini sui, *Surge, quid facis?* inquit, *Illum adora: nam et ego conservus tuus sum, et fratrum tuorum.* Quid ergo fratres mei? Nemo dicat, Timeo ne irascatur mihi angelus, si non illum colo pro Deo meo. Tunc tibi irascitur, quando ipsum colere volueris. bonus est enim, et Deum amat. Quomodo [enim] dæmones irascuntur, si non colantur: sic angeli indignantur, si pro Deo colantur.

the angel, who sought nothing but the glory of his Lord, said, Arise, what dost thou? Worship God: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren. How is it, then, my brethren? Let no one say, I fear lest the angel should be angry at me, if I do not worship him for my God. He is then only angry at thee, when thou art inclined to worship him. For he is good, and loves God: and as the devils are angry, if they be not worshipped: so the angels are highly displeased, if they be worshipped instead of God.' At last he concludes[63] with this admonition to the Pagans: 'Let the Pagans learn to adore God. They have a mind to adore angels: let them imitate angels, and adore him whom the angels adore.'

And with these words I shall conclude this whole discourse of religious worship; knowing no better admonition that can be given to the angel-worshippers of the present age, than to advise them to imitate the angelical practice of the primitive Church, who had God and only God for the object of their adoration.

CHAP. IV.

That anciently divine service was always performed in the vulgar tongue understood by the people.

1. Having thus considered the nature and object of Christian worship, I come now to speak of the circumstances and manner of performing divine service. And here it will be proper to examine in what language the Ancients performed their worship; and to inquire into the use and original of what we commonly call *liturgies*, or *set forms of prayer;* and to take notice of the habits and modes, and gestures, and different rites and ceremonies observed, without any breach of faith or Christian unity, in different Churches; together with the solemn times of prayer and religious assemblies, whether weekly or daily, generally observed and set apart for the exercise of public devotion.

This proved, first, from plain testimonies of the Ancients asserting it.

As to the first of these, there is nothing more certain in history, than that the service of the ancient Church was always performed in the vulgar or common language of every country,

[63] In Ps. 96. (ibid. e.) Discant Pagani adorare Deum. Angelos volunt adorare: angelos imitentur, et illum adorent, qui ab angelis adoratur.

that is, such as was either commonly spoken, or at least commonly understood. And so it continued for above a thousand years in the Church. And it is even monstrous to think that in so inquisitive an age as the present is there should be any men of learning to defend, or whole nations so tamely to submit to the imposition and tyranny of the contrary practice; so absurd and unreasonable in itself; so prejudicial to devotion; so contrary to the use of speech, whose end is edification; so reproachful to human nature, 'as if men were asses indeed,' as Thomas Aquinas once made the comparison[63]; so derogatory to the Christian's birthright; so flatly contradictory to the Apostle's reasoning; and so diametrically opposite to the universal practice of the Church for so many ages. But I shall not think myself obliged to dispute against it upon all these topics, nor to say all that might be said in an historical way against it. He that pleases may see that done already in an excellent book of Bishop Usher's, published by Mr. Wharton[64]. I shall content myself to suggest a few things agreeable to the design of treating matters succinctly, which will be sufficient to satisfy any candid reader as to the sense and practice of the primitive Church.

And first I observe, that the Ancients declare unanimously that divine service was performed in the vulgar tongue of every nation. 'The Grecians,' says Origen[65], 'use the Greek language in their prayers, and the Romans the Roman, and so every one, in his own dialect, prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able: and the God of all languages hears them that pray in all dialects, understanding their different languages as well as if they all spake with one tongue.' This he says in

[63] [I fail in discovering the authority for this remark: but it may be worth while to bear in mind Aquinas's Commentary on 1 Cor. 14, especially sectio 5. (Venet. 1775, t. 6. p. 332.) *Quod enim non intelligitur reputatur insanitio &c.* Perhaps the Author had in mind the objection in the context,—*Idem est loqui linguis et loqui literaliter quantum ad idiotas: cum ergo omnes loquantur literaliter in ecclesia, quia omnia dicuntur in Latino, videtur quod similiter sit insania.* Ed.]

[64] Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, cum Auctario H. Wharton. Lond. 1690. 4°. [Works, Dublin 1847, v. 12. p. 145, without Wharton's Auctarium.]

[65] Cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 402. (t. 1. p. 769 f.) Ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες Ἑλληνικοῖς χρῶνται, οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥωμαϊστὶ καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὔχεται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ὑμνεῖ αὐτὸν ὡς δύναται· καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου Κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει, ὡς μιᾶς, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, φωνῆς, τῆς κατὰ τὰ σημαινόμενα, ἀκούων, δηλουμένης ἐκ τῶν ποικίλων διαλέκτων.

answer to an objection of Celsus, who charged them with using of barbarous and unintelligible names and words in their prayers. Justin Martyr[66] says, 'The Scriptures were first read in their assemblies to the people, and then the president made a discourse to them, exhorting them to observe and follow the good instructions they had heard out of the Prophets and Apostles.' Which had been an absurd admonition, had not the lessons been read in a language, which they understood. St. Jerom[67] tells us, 'that at the funeral of the famous lady, Paula, the psalms were sung in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, because there were men of each language present at the solemnity.' And for the same reason Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, is said[68] 'to have appointed the people to sing the psalms and hymns, some in Greek, and some in Latin;' no doubt that the divine service might be understood by men of different languages then present in the assembly. Aurelius Cassiodore[69], writing upon those words of the Psalmist, "She shall be brought unto the king in raiment of divers colours," says, 'This variety signified that diversity of tongues, wherewith every nation sang to God in the Church, according to the difference of their own country language.' And it being then the way of the Church that all offices should be performed with the understanding and edification of the people, Justinian provided for this in one of his laws[70], obliging 'all bishops and presbyters to repeat

[66] Apol. 2. (p. 98 d.) Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων, κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται, μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ· εἶτα, παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.

[67] Epitaph. Paulæ, Ep. 27. [al. 108.] (t. 1. p. 717 a.) . . . . Græco, Latino, Syroque sermone Psalmi in ordine personabant.

[68] Vid. Cypr. Gall. Vit. Cæsar. Arelatens. ap. Surium, Aug. 27. (t. 4. p. 947.) Voluit vero atque etiam compulit laicos et populares homines psalmos et hymnos promere, altaque et modulata voce, instar clericorum, alios Græce, alios Latine, prosas et antiphonas decantare, &c. [Conf. Pagi, Crit. in Baron. an. 397. n. 11. (t. 2. p. 14.) Theodorus Petræ episcopus . . . rem notabilem refert de S. Niceta: *Quatuor ecclesias*, inquit, *intra septa monasterii construxit. Unam quidem, in qua patrum numerosus cœtus seorsim lingua Græca Deo immolat, uti scriptum est, sacrificium laudis. Altera[m], in qua Bessi propria ipsorum lingua vota et preces reddunt Deo altissimo. Tertiam, in qua Armeni lingua patria Domino litant.* &c. Ed.]

[69] In Ps. 44. al. 45. v. 11. (t. 2. p. 143.) Hic varietatem aut linguas multiplices significat, quia omnis gens secundum suam patriam in ecclesia psallit Auctori; aut virtutum pulcherrimam diversitatem.

[70] Novel. 137. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 611.) Ad hæc jubemus omnes episcopos

the prayers used in the communion and baptismal service, not in secret, but with an audible voice, so as the minds of the hearers might be raised to greater devotion, and stirred up to glorify the Lord God. For so the holy Apostle directs in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, (14, 16.) saying, "If thou blessest only with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say the holy Amen! to God at thy giving of thanks? For he knoweth not what thou sayest. For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified."' It is plain by this, that Justinian thought all prayers, which the people either could not hear or could not understand, were equally blamed by the Apostle, as not contributing to edification; and therefore as he made a law against private muttering of prayers, which ought to be public, so he would no doubt have been as severe against praying in an unknown tongue, had there then been any occasion, as there was not, for the like prohibition in the Liturgy of the Church. Which may be collected from another of his laws, which was made upon occasion of a dispute which in his time arose among the Jews. Some of them who were superstitiously inclined were for having the Law read only in Hebrew, though not understood by the people: others were for having it read in Greek, or any language which the people understood. The matter at last was brought before Justinian, and he determined[71] in favour of the latter, that it should be read in Greek, or any other language which the place where they lived had made more

et presbyteros, non in secreto, sed cum ea voce, quæ a fidelissimo populo exaudiatur, divinam obligationem, [*προσκομιδὴν, oblationem,* juxt. Ed. Græc. Amstel. 1663.] et precationem, quæ fit in sancto baptismate, facere; ut inde audientium animi in majorem devotionem, et Dei laudationem et benedictionem efferantur. Sic enim et divinus Apostolus docet, dicens in priore ad Corinthios Epistola: Cæterum, inquit, si solum benedicis spiritu, is, qui idiotæ locum implet, quomodo tuæ gratiarum actioni subjiciet Deo sanctum illud Amen! siquidem quid dicas non novit? tu autem pulchre gratias agis, sed alius non ædificatur.

[71] Novel. 146. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 621.) Sancimus igitur licentiam esse volentibus Hebræis per synagogas suas, in quocunque Hebræi omnino loco sunt, per Græcam vocem sacros libros legere convenientibus, vel etiam patria forte, Italica hac dicimus, lingua, vel etiam aliorum simpliciter, una scilicet cum locis etiam lingua commutata, et per ipsorum lectionem, per quam clara sunt quæ dicuntur, convenientibus omnibus deinceps, et secundum hæc vivere, et conversari: neque fiduciam esse his, qui apud eos sunt, expositoribus solam Hebraicam tradentibus, malignari hanc, quemadmodum voluerint, multorum ignorantia suam ipsorum abscondentes malam consuetudinem.

useful and known to the people. Hitherto therefore we are assured this corruption had made no attempt to gain admittance in the service of the Christian Church, since it was corrected by the civil magistrate as soon as it was observed to be creeping into the Jewish synagogue.

2. Secondly, as a further evidence of this matter, we may observe that all the people anciently were allowed to join in psalmody and prayers, and make their proper responses. The learned and unlearned, nay, even women, young virgins, and children, in those times bare a part in the public service of the Church. St. Chrysostom[72] and the Author of the Constitutions[73] speak of children praying with the rest of the congregation for the catechumens and the faithful also. And St. Jerom[74] speaks of young virgins singing the psalter at morning and evening, at the third, and sixth, and ninth hours, and at midnight in their course; and says they were obliged to learn the Psalms and some portion of Scripture every day. St. Basil[75] and many others, as we shall see hereafter when we speak of psalmody, say all the people sung the Psalms alternately; and Basil[76] particularly takes notice of children performing this office in common with the rest of the people. And we shall meet with the people's prayers and responses almost in every part of the liturgy, such as the Κύριε ἐλέησον,

Secondly, From the people's joining in psalmody and prayer, and making their responses.

72 Hom. 71. in Matth. p. 624. (t. 7. p. 699 e.) Καὶ ἡ τρίτη [δέησις] πάλιν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ αὕτη τὰ παιδία τὰ ἄμωμα τοῦ δήμου προβάλλεται, τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ ἔλεον παρακαλοῦντα. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτοὶ κατεγνώκαμεν ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα, ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν πολλὰ ἡμαρτηκότων, καὶ ἐγκληθῆναι ὀφειλόντων αὐτοὶ βοῶμεν· ὑπὲρ δὲ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν οἱ παῖδες, ὧν τῆς ἁπλότητος τοὺς ζηλωτὰς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν μένει.

73 L. 8. c. 6. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 393.) ... Λεγέτω ὁ λαὸς, Κύριε ἐλέησον· καὶ πρὸ πάντων τὰ παιδία.

74 Epitaph. Paulæ, Ep. 27. [al. 108.] c. 10. (t. 1. p. 706 c.) Mane, hora tertia, sexta, nona, vespere, noctis medio, per ordinem Psalterium cantabant. Nec licebat cuiquam sororum ignorare psalmos, et non de scripturis sanctis quotidie aliquid discere.

75 Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 450 b. n. 3.) Ἐκ νυκτὸς γὰρ ὀρθρίζει παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς, καὶ ἐν πόνῳ, καὶ [ἐν] θλίψει, καὶ [ἐν] συνοχῇ δακρύων ἐξομολογούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ, τελευταῖον [ἐξ]ἀναστάντες τῶν προσευχῶν, εἰς τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν καθίστανται· καὶ νῦν μὲν διχῇ διανεμηθέντες, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὁμοῦ μὲν τὴν μελέτην τῶν λογίων ἐντεῦθεν κρατύνοντες, κ.τ.λ.

76 Proœm. in Psalmos. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 127 d. n. 1.) Διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἐναρμόνια ταῦτα μέλη τῶν ψαλμῶν ἡμῖν ἐπινενόηται, ἵνα οἱ παῖδες τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἣ καὶ ὅλως οἱ νεαροὶ τὸ ἦθος, τῷ μὲν δοκεῖν μελῳδῶσι, τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐκπαιδεύωνται.—Conf. Venant. Fortunat. l. 2. Poëmat. in Laud. Cler. Parisiaci: (ap. Corp. Poëtar. t. 2. p. 1715.) Pontificis monitis clerus, plebs, psallit et infans.

Lord have mercy! subjoined to every petition of the deacon's prayers; and in those mutual prayers of minister and people, The Lord be with you! And with thy spirit! Lift up your hearts! We lift them up unto the Lord! with abundance more that need not here be mentioned. All which suppose the service to be in the vulgar and known language; else it were absurd to think that the people should know how and when to make their responses, or that children and young virgins should learn the Psalms and Scripture by heart, and join in psalmody and other parts of the service of the Church.

Thirdly, From the frequent exhortations of the Fathers to the people to hear, and read, and pray, with understanding.

3. Thirdly, there is nothing more common among the Ancients in their discourses to the people, than to admonish and exhort them both to hear, and read, and pray with understanding, attention, and fervency of spirit. Which had been very incongruous admonitions, obliging them to impracticable rules, had the lessons and prayers been in an unknown tongue. St. Basil[77] thus exhorts his people: 'Thou hast the Psalms, thou hast the Prophets, the precepts of the Gospel, the preachings of the Apostles; let thy tongue sing, and thy mind search the meaning of what is spoken; that thou mayest sing with the spirit, and sing with understanding also.' In another Homily[78] he tells them, 'that the Divine Oracles were God's gifts to the Church, to be read in every assembly, as the food which the Spirit afforded us for the nourishment of our souls.' And in another place[79], putting the question, How a man prays with the spirit, whilst his understanding is unfruitful?

[77] Hom. in Ps. 28. Serm. 1. t. 1. p. 154. (ibid. p. 175 b. n. 7.) Ψαλμὸν ἔχεις, προφητείαν ἔχεις· εὐαγγελικὰ παραγγέλματα· τὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων κηρύγματα. Ἡ γλῶσσα ψαλλέτω· ὁ νοῦς ἐρευνάτω τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν εἰρημένων, ἵνα ψάλλῃς τῷ Πνεύματι, ψάλλῃς δὲ καὶ τῷ νοΐ.

[78] Hom. in Ps. 59. p. 253. (ibid. 271 e. n. 2.) Τὰ ἡμέτερά ἐστι τὰ θεῖα λόγια, καὶ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς θεόπεμπτα δῶρα, καθ' ἕκαστον σύλλογον ὑπαναγινώσκεται, οἷόν τις τροφὴ ψυχῶν, χορηγουμένη διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος.

[79] Regul. Brev. quæst. 278. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 733 c.) Πῶς τὸ Πνεῦμά τινος προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἄκαρπός ἐστιν; Ἀπόκρισις. Τοῦτο περὶ τῶν ἐν γλώσσῃ ἀγνοουμένῃ τοῖς ἀκούουσι τὰς προσευχὰς ἀναπεμπόντων ἐρρήθη· φησὶ γὰρ, Ἐὰν προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστιν. Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἄγνωστα ᾖ τοῖς παροῦσι τὰ ῥήματα τῆς προσευχῆς, ἄκαρπός ἐστιν ὁ νοῦς τοῦ προσευχομένου, μηδενὸς ὠφελουμένου. Ὅταν δὲ οἱ παρόντες νοῶσι τὴν προσευχὴν ὠφελεῖν δυναμένην τοὺς ἀκούοντας, τότε ὁ προσευχόμενος καρπὸν ἔχει, τὴν τῶν ὠφελουμένων βελτίωσιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πάσης ἐκφωνήσεως τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥημάτων· γέγραπται γὰρ, Ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς πίστεως.

He answers, 'That this was spoken of those that prayed in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For the Apostle says, "If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit indeed prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." (1 Cor. 14, 14.) For when the words of the prayer are not known to them that are present, the understanding of him that prayeth is unfruitful, because his prayer is of no use or advantage: but when they, that are present, understand the prayer, which is of advantage to the hearers; then he, that prays, reaps the fruit of it, namely, the edification of those, who receive benefit by it. And we are to conceive in like manner of all utterance of the words of God. For it is written[79], "If any be useful for edification in the faith." By all this it is evident, the Scriptures and Psalms and prayers were read in a known tongue: for otherwise it were in vain to exhort men to give diligence and attention to understand what they heard, if every thing was spoken in a language, which they did not, or could not understand.

Fourthly, From the references made by the Fathers to the prayers and lessons in the service of the Church.

4. Fourthly, the Fathers in their sermons frequently refer to the prayers of the Church, and to the lessons read before, as things the people were perfectly well acquainted with. They often argue from matters contained in the prayers, as Chrysostom does commonly from all parts of the liturgy: and their sermons for the most part were upon such portions of Scripture, as had just been read before, as I shall show, when I come to the office of preaching. Now this supposes that both the prayers and lessons of Scripture were in a known tongue; else it were absurd for the preachers to appeal to their auditors as well acquainted with them, or draw arguments from thence, as motives grounded upon their own experience, if yet indeed they had no knowledge of them.

Fifthly, From the Scriptures being translated into all languages

5. Fifthly, this is evident from that pious care which the Church took to have the Bible translated into all languages: and as soon as any nation was converted, that spake an uncommon tongue, immediately to procure a new version of the Scriptures into their language. Eusebius[80] says, 'they were

[79] [Compare 1 Cor. 14, 12.... Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church, with v. 26. Let all things be done unto edifying. Ed.]

[80] De Præparat. Evangel. l. 12. c. 1. (p. 573 d.) Ἔνθεν καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὲν ἄρτι εἰσαγομένοις, καὶ τὴν ἕξιν ἀτελέσιν, ὡς ἂν τὰς ψυχὰς νηπίοις, ἁπλούστερον ἢ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς

from the first foundation of Churches.

translated into all languages, both of Greeks and Barbarians, throughout the world, and studied by all nations as the oracles of God.' Chrysostom[81] assures us, 'that the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, the Ethiopians, and a multitude of other nations, translated them into their own tongues, whereby barbarians learned to be philosophers, and women and children with the greatest ease imbibed the doctrine of the Gospel.' Theodoret[82] says the same, 'that every nation under heaven had the Scripture in their own tongue: the Hebrew books were not only translated into Greek, but into the Roman, Egyptian, Persian, Indian, Armenian, Scythian, and Sauromatic languages, and in a word into all tongues used by all nations in his time.' The like is attested by St. Jerom[83] and St. Austin[84] and many others. Ulphilas is said by all the historians[85] to have translated the whole Bible into the Gothic

ἀνάγνωσις παραδίδοται, μετα τοῦ δεῖν πιστεύειν ὡς Θεοῦ λόγοις τοῖς ἐμφερομένοις παρακελεύεσθαι· τοῖς δὲ τὴν ἕξιν προβεβηκόσι, καὶ πολιοῖς τὸ φρόνημα, ἐμβαθύνειν, καὶ δοκιμάζειν τὸν νοῦν τῶν λεγομένων ἐπιτέτραπται.—Conf. De Laud. Constant. c. 17. (v. 1. p. 772. 20.) *Καὶ τοσαύτην αὐτοῖς ἀρετήν τε καὶ δύναμιν παρασχεῖν, ὡς καὶ γραφὰς συντάξαι, καὶ βίβλους παραδοῦναι· καὶ πάντας εἰς τοσοῦτο κρατῦναι, ὡς καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης, παντοίᾳ γλώσσῃ βαρβάρων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων μεταβαλλομένας, παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι μελετᾶσθαι· καὶ πιστεύεσθαι θεῖα εἶναι λόγια τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς καταβεβλημένα, κ. τ. λ.*

[81] Hom. 1. [Ed. Bened. 2. al. 1.] in Ioan. (t. 8. p. 10 b.) *Ἀλλὰ καὶ Σύροι, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, καὶ Ἰνδοὶ, καὶ Πέρσαι, καὶ Αἰθίοπες, καὶ μύρια ἕτερα ἔθνη, εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν μεταβαλόντες γλῶτταν τὰ παρὰ τούτου [Ἰωάννου] δόγματα εἰσαχθέντα, ἔμαθον ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι φιλοσοφεῖν. . . . Τοσαύτην τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐγκατέμιξεν εὐκολίαν, ὡς μὴ μόνον ἀνδράσι καὶ συνετοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναιξὶ καὶ νέοις, ἅπαντα εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα δῆλα.*

[82] Græcor. Affect. Curat. Serm. 5. [al. Disput. 5.] t. 4. p. 555. (t. 4. part. 2. p. 839.) *Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν καὶ προφητικῶν δογμάτων τὸ κράτος ἐναργῶς ἐπιδείκνυμεν· πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ ὑφήλιος τῶνδε τῶν λόγων ἀνάπλεως· καὶ ἡ Ἑβραίων φωνὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς τὴν Ἑλλήνων μετεβλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων, καὶ Αἰγυπτίων, καὶ Περσῶν, καὶ Ἰνδῶν, καὶ Ἀρμενίων, καὶ Σκυθῶν, καὶ Σαυροματῶν, καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν, εἰς πάσας τὰς γλώττας αἷς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη κεχρημένα διατελεῖ.*

[83] Præf. in Quat. Evangel. ad Damas. (t. 10. p. 658.) Novum opus me facere cogis ex veteri: ut post exemplaria Scripturarum, toto orbe dispersa, quasi quidam arbiter sedeam, &c.—Ibid. (p. 661.) Quum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse, quæ addita sunt.

[84] Ep. 48. [al. 93.] ad Vincent. (t. 2. p. 240 d.) In hoc et clama et contende, quantum potes, etiamsi apud Persas et Indos evangelium prædicetur, ubi quidem jam diu prædicatur, &c.—Ibid. (p. 246 f.) Neque enim sic potuit integritas atque notitia literarum unius quamlibet illustris episcopi custodiri, quemadmodum Scriptura canonica, tot linguarum literis, et ordine, et successione celebrationis ecclesiasticæ custoditur, &c.

[85] Socrat. l. 4. c. 33. (v. 2. p. 256. 7.) *Τότε δὲ καὶ Οὐλφίλας, ὁ τῶν Γότθων ἐπίσκοπος, γράμματα ἐφεῦρε Γοτθικά· καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς εἰς τὴν Γότθων μεταβαλὼν, τοὺς βαρβάρους*

tongue. St. Jerom translated it into the Dalmatic, as he himself[86] seems to intimate, when he calls it his own tongue; as Scaliger and most others understand him; though Bishop Usher[87] thinks he meant the Latin rather by his own tongue. St. Chrysostom[88] sometimes mentions the Syriac translation; and he is said by the author of his Life[89] to have procured, during his exile at Cucusus in Armenia, a translation of the Psalms and New Testament for the use of the Armenian Churches. Not to mention that of Methodius or Cyril into the Sclavonian tongue, or any others of later ages; of which the curious reader may find exact accounts in Bp. Usher[90], Bp. Walton[91], Dr. Milles[92], and Hottinger[93], and others upon this peculiar subject of the Scripture-versions.

Sixthly, From the use of the order of interpreters in the Church.

6. As to the ancient practice, it may be evidenced further and confirmed from the use of the interpreters in the Church, whose office, as has been shown in another place[94] out of Epiphanius[95] and other writers, was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures and in the homilies that were made to the people. For it happened sometimes that there were men of different languages in the same Church: as in the Churches of Syria and Palestine some understood Syriac only, and others Greek; and in the

μανθάνειν τὰ θεῖα λόγια παρεσκεύασεν. —Sozom. l. 6. c. 37. (ibid. p. 274. 8.) *Πρῶτον γραμμάτων εὑρετὴς αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο* [*Οὐλφίλας*] *καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν φωνὴν μετέφρασε τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους.* [Vid. ap. Cav. Hist. Liter. in voc. Ulphilas, anno 365, ubi plura. Ed.]

86 Ep. 134. ad Sophron. [al. Præf. in Libr. Psal.] (t. 9. p. 1155.) Nec hæc dico, quo præcessores meos mordeam, aut quidquam his arbitrer detrahendum; quorum translationem, diligentissime emendatam, olim meæ linguæ hominibus dederim, &c.

87 Hist. Dogmat. &c. p. 221. (Works, [c. 8. s. 1.] v. 12. p. 423.) .... Per *linguæ suæ homines* Latinos potius intelligere videatur, quam Dalmatas.

88 Hom. 3. in 2 Cor. p. 754. (t. 10. pp. 441, seqq.) [There is no mention of the Syriac in this place. The author probably had in mind Hom. 1. al. 2. in Ioan. cited just before. See n. 81, preceding. Ed.]

89 Georg. Alexandr. Vit. Chrysost. 59. (ap. Ed. Savil. t. 8. p. 236. 22.) *Εὗρε γὰρ κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ τινας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπισταμένους τὴν Ἑλληνίδα γλῶσσαν, καὶ παρεσκεύασεν αὐτοὺς μεταφράσαι τὴν Νέαν Διαθήκην καὶ τὸ Ψαλτήριον τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ, ὅπως γνῶσιν λάβωσι τῆς θείας γραφῆς.*

90 Ubi supra, p. 210. (ibid. pp. 410, seqq.) Scripturæ passim in linguis vulgaribus exstabant.

91 Prolegom. c. v. (t. 1. p. 34.) De Bibliorum Versionibus. Vid. n. 11. (p. 35.) Aliam etiam habent Sclavoni, &c.

92 Prolegom. in Nov. Test. [Conf. s. 377. (p. 41.) s. 1188. (p. 121.) s. 1369. (p. 147.) s. 1399. (p. 151.) Ed.]

93 De Translat. Biblior. dissert. 3. ap. Fasciculum. (pp. 89, seqq.)

94 B. 3. ch. 13. s. 4. v. 1. p. 363.

95 Expos. Fid. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 1104 c.) *Ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις.*

African Churches some spake Latin and others Punic: in which cases, whatever was said in one language was immediately rendered into the other by the interpreter for the benefit of the people. In confirmation of which custom, to what has been said before I shall here add the observation of Theodoret[96] upon the practice of Chrysostom, who by the help of such an interpreter often preached to the Arian Goths in Constantinople, whom by that means he reduced to the Catholic faith.

Seventhly, From the custom of having Bibles laid in churches for the people to read in private.

7. Another custom observed in the ancient Church, was to have Bibles in the vulgar tongue laid in a convenient part of the church, for the people at their leisure to employ themselves, as they were piously inclined, in reading of the Scriptures before or after the times of divine service. Of which custom those verses of Paulinus[97], which he wrote upon the wall of the *secretarium* of the church of Nola, are an infallible proof, which were in these words;

> *Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in lege voluntas,*
> *Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris.*

If any one is piously disposed to meditate in God's Law, here he may sit, and employ himself in reading the holy books.

Thus Constantine himself, as is observed by Eusebius[98], was wont to employ himself in the church, partly by joining in the public prayers with the people, and partly by taking the books of the Divine Oracles into his hands, and exercising his mind in the contemplation of them. And probably for this reason he ordered Eusebius[99] to prepare fifty copies of the Bible for

[96] L. 5. c. 30. (v. 3. p. 231. 12.) Αὐτός τε γὰρ τὰ πλεῖστα ἐκεῖσε φοιτῶν διελέγετο, ἑρμηνευτῇ χρώμενος τῷ ἑκατέραν γλῶσσαν ἐπισταμένῳ τινὶ, καὶ τοὺς λέγειν ἐπισταμένους τοῦτο παρεσκεύαζε δρᾶν. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔνδον ἐν τῇ πόλει διετέλει ποιῶν, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐξηπατημένων ἐζώγρει, τῶν ἀποστολικῶν κηρυγμάτων ἐπιδεικνὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

[97] Ep. 12. ad Sever. (p. 154.)

[98] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 17. (v. 1. p. 635. 1.) Μετὰ χεῖρας γέτοι λαμβάνων τὰς βίβλους τῇ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λογίων θεωρίᾳ προσανεῖχε τὸν νοῦν· εἶτ' εὐχὰς ἐνθέσμους σὺν τοῖς τὸν βασίλειον οἶκον πληροῦσιν ἀπεδίδου.

[99] Ibid. c. 36. (v. 1. p. 646. 12.) Πρέπον γὰρ κατεφάνη, τὸ δηλῶσαι τῇ σῇ συνέσει, ὅπως ἂν πεντήκοντα σωμάτια ἐν διφθέραις ἐγκατασκεύοις, εὐανάγνωστά τε καὶ πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν εὐμετακόμιστα, ὑπὸ τεχνιτῶν καλλιγράφων καὶ ἀκριβῶς τὴν τέχνην ἐπισταμένων, γραφῆναι κελεύσειας.—Conf. Theodor. l. 1. c. 16. (v. 3. p. 45. 12.) et Socrat. l. 1. c. 6. (v. 2. p. 35. 20.) where the same words are to be read.

the use of the Church of Constantinople, as his letter to Eusebius witnesses; for it is observed, and spoken to his praise, by Eusebius in another place [1], 'that by his means innumerable multitudes both of men and women exchanged the food of their bodies for that of their souls, that rational food which was so agreeable to rational minds, and which they obtained by reading the Holy Scriptures.' This must necessarily relate either to their reading the Scriptures by the help and benefit of his copies in the church; or else will argue that they were encouraged by him to read them at home in their private houses; which had been denied them under pain of banishment or death before, in the preceding reigns of the persecuting princes.

Eighthly, From the general allowance granted to all men to have and read the Scriptures in their mother-tongue. Which privilege was never infringed by any but the Heathen persecutors.

8. And this leads us to another plain evidence of the primitive practice: which was the privilege and encouragement all Christians had to read the Scriptures at home, for the exercise of themselves and families in private devotion, and better preparation for the public. None ever denied them this privilege, but those persecuting tyrants, who intended to destroy the name and faith of Christians, together with their Bibles, out of the world: for which reason they made the strictest search after them, and used all imaginable art and force to make them deliver them up to be burnt: which they who did, were branded by the infamous name of *traditores, traitors* and *betrayers* of their religion. A certain argument, that then private Christians had the use of the Scriptures; else they could not have been impeached for delivering them up to the enemy. It cannot be pleaded here, that the Scriptures were then only in the hands of the bishops, and readers, and others of the clergy: for Baronius himself has published the Acts of several Martyrs, where not only private men, but women confess to the inquisitors that they had the Holy Scriptures in their houses with them. I will give a single instance out of the Acts of Agape and Irene [2] and their companions. Where the

[1] De Laud. Constant. c. 17. (ibid. p. 771. 16.) *Τίς γύναια καὶ μύρια πλήθη ἀνδρῶν ἀναπέπεικε, λογικὰς τροφὰς ψυχαῖς λογικαῖς καταλλήλους, δι' ἐνθέων ἀναγνωσμάτων, ἀντικαταλλάξασθαι τῶν τοῦ σώματος τροφῶν;*

[2] Ap. Baron. an. 304. n. 44. (t. 2. p. 780 b.) Quisnam tibi auctor fuit, ut membranas istas atque Scripturas in hodiernum usque diem custodires? Irene inquit, Deus Omnipotens, qui jussit nos ad mortem usque ipsum diligere, qua de causa

grand inquisitor asks this question of Irene, 'Who advised you to keep those parchments and Scriptures to this time?' To which Irene answered, 'God Almighty, who has commanded us to love him unto the death; for which cause we durst not betray him; but had rather be burnt alive, or suffer any other things that may befall us, than treacherously deliver up those writings.' It is plain from this, that private Christians, both men and women, then enjoyed the Scriptures as their birthright, and none pretended to ravish them from them but only the persecuting Heathens.

The Fathers of the Church were so far from doing this, that on the contrary they used all manner of arguments to induce men to read and study them; exhorting them not only to hear them with attention in the church, but to read them privately at home with their wives and families; commending those that studied them, and reproving those that neglected them; making large encomiums upon the use and excellency of them, and requiring men to peruse them privately as the best preparation for the public service and instruction; answering all objections and pretences that men could make to the contrary; as that they were ignorant and unlearned, and that the Scriptures were difficult and hard to be understood; that they were only for the use of monks and religious, and not for secular men, and men of business; assuring them, that the Scriptures were for the use of all men, and that it was the neglect of them that was the cause of all ignorance, heresies, errors, and irreligion. These were the general topics, upon which the Fathers then pressed the common people to read the Scriptures, which are diametrically opposite to the arguments used in later ages to dissuade and deter men from the use of them. A man cannot look into the Fathers, but he will see such arguments every where running through their writings. So that it is needless here to insist upon them: the reader, that pleases, may see them collected together from first to last by Bp. Usher, and Mr. Wharton[2]. I shall only relate one passage of Chrysostom out of his famous Sermons upon Lazarus, where he at once

non ausi sumus eum prodere, sed maluimus aut viventes comburi, aut quæcunque alia nobis acciderint, perpeti, quam talia Scripta prodere.

[2] [As cited before, s. 1. p. 342. n. 64. Ed.]

proposes the several arguments, and answers the several objections I have now mentioned.

'For this reason,' says he[3], 'we often acquaint you many days beforehand with the subject of our discourse, that taking the Bible into your hands in the mean time, and running over the whole passage, you may have your minds better prepared to hear what is to be spoken. And this is the thing I have always advised, and shall still continue to exhort you to, that you should not only hear what is said in this place, but spend your time at home continually in reading the Holy Scriptures.

[3] Hom. 3. in Lazar. t. 5. p. 59. (t. 1. p. 737 a. 26.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῶν μελλόντων ῥηθήσεσθαι πολλάκις ὑμῖν προλέγομεν πρὸ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς μεταξὺ ταύταις ἡμέραις τὸ βιβλίον λαβόντες, καὶ τὴν περικοπὴν ἅπασαν ἐπιόντες, καὶ καταμαθόντες τί μὲν εἴρηται, τί δὲ ὑπολέλειπται, εὐμαθεστέραν ὑμῶν ποιήσητε τὴν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ῥηθησομένων. Καὶ τοῦτο ἀεὶ παρακαλῶ, καὶ παρακαλῶν οὐ παύσομαι, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἐνταῦθα τοῖς λεγομένοις προσέχητε, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἴκοι γινόμενοι τῇ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει συνεχῶς ἐνδιατρίβητε· τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς ἰδίᾳ συγγινομένοις ἡμῖν οὐ διέλιπον ἀεὶ παρεγγυῶν. Μὴ γάρ μοι λεγέτω τις τὰ ψυχρὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα, καὶ πολλῆς καταγνώσεως ἄξια, ὅτι δικαστηρίῳ προσήλωμαι, τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράττω πράγματα, τέχνην μετέρχομαι, γυναῖκα ἔχω, παιδία τρέφω, οἰκίας προΐσταμαι, ἀνὴρ εἰμι βιωτικός· οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν γραφὰς ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀποταξομένων, τῶν τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων κατειληφότων, τῶν τοῦτον τὸν βίον ἐχόντων διηνεκῶς. Τί λέγεις, ἄνθρωπε; οὐκ ἔστι σὸν ἔργον Γραφαῖς προσέχειν, ἐπειδὴ μυρίαις περιέλκῃ φροντίσι; σὸν μὲν οὖν μᾶλλόν ἐστιν, ἢ ἐκείνων· οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἐκεῖνοι χρήζουσι τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν βοηθείας, ὡς οἱ ἐν μέσῳ στρεφόμενοι πραγμάτων πολλῶν. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ μοναχοὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀπαλλαγέντες θορύβων, καὶ τὰς καλύβας ἐν ἐρημίᾳ πηξάμενοι, καὶ πρὸς οὐδένα κοινὸν οὐδὲν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐμφιλοσοφοῦντες μετὰ ἀδείας τῇ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἐκείνης γαλήνῃ, καθάπερ ἐν λιμένι καθήμενοι, πολλῆς τῆς ἀσφαλείας ἀπολαύουσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ, οἱ καθάπερ ἐν μέσῳ πελάγει σαλεύοντες, καὶ μυρίων ἁμαρτημάτων ἀνάγκας ἔχοντες, συνεχοῦς καὶ διηνεκοῦς ἀεὶ δεόμεθα τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Γραφῶν παρακλήσεως. Ἐκεῖνοι πόῤῥω τῆς μάχης κάθηνται, διόπερ οὐδὲ πολλὰ δέχονται τραύματα· σὺ δὲ διηνεκῶς ἐπὶ τῆς παρατάξεως ἕστηκας, καὶ συνεχεῖς δέχῃ τὰς πληγὰς, διὸ καὶ πλειόνων σοι δεῖ τῶν φαρμάκων· καὶ γὰρ γυνὴ παροξύνει, καὶ υἱὸς λυπεῖ, καὶ οἰκέτης εἰς ὀργὴν ἐμβάλλει, καὶ ἐχθρὸς ἐπιβουλεύει, καὶ φίλος βασκαίνει, καὶ γείτων ἐπηρεάζει, καὶ συστρατιώτης ὑποσκελίζει, πολλάκις καὶ δικαστὴς ἀπειλεῖ, καὶ πενία λυπεῖ, καὶ ἀποβολὴ τῶν οἰκείων πένθος ἐργάζεται, καὶ εὐημερία φυσᾷ, καὶ δυσπραγία συστέλλει, καὶ πολλαὶ μὲν ὀργῆς, πολλαὶ δὲ φροντίδων, πολλαὶ δὲ ἀθυμίας καὶ λύπης, πολλαὶ δὲ κενοδοξίας καὶ ἀπονοίας ἀφορμαὶ καὶ ἀνάγκαι πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιστοιχίζονται, καὶ μύρια πανταχόθεν τὰ βέλη φέρεται· διὸ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Γραφῶν πανοπλίας χρεία διηνεκῶς. . . . . (p. 738 a.) Καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτά ἐστι τὰ πολιορκοῦντα τὴν ἡμετέραν ψυχήν· καὶ δεῖ τῶν θείων φαρμάκων ἡμῖν, ἵνα καὶ τὰ γινόμενα ἕλκη θεραπεύωμεν, καὶ τὰ μηδέπω μὲν γινόμενα, μέλλοντα δὲ γίνεσθαι, προαναστέλλωμεν, πόῤῥωθεν τοῦ Διαβόλου τὰ βέλη κατασβεννύντες καὶ ἀποκρουόμενοι διὰ τῆς συνεχοῦς τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσεως· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστι τινὰ σωθῆναι μὴ συνεχῶς ἀναγνώσεως ἀπολαύοντα πνευματικῆς.

And here let no one use those frigid and vain excuses, I am a man engaged in the business of the law, I am taken up with civil affairs, I am a tradesman, I have a wife and children to breed up, I have the care of a family, I am a secular man: it belongs not to me to read the Scriptures, but to those that have bid adieu to the world, and are retired into the mountains, and have nothing else to do but to exercise themselves in such a way of living. What sayest thou, O man? Is it not thy business to read the Scriptures, because thou art distracted with a multitude of other cares? Yes, certainly, it belongs to thee more than to them. For they have not so much need of the help of the Holy Scriptures as you have, who are tossed in the waves of the multiplicity of business.' Then enumerating what sins and temptations secular men are exposed to, he infers, 'that they have perpetual need of divine remedies, as well to cure the wounds they have already received, as to ward off those they are in danger of receiving: to quench the darts of the Devil, whilst they are at a distance, and drive them away by continual reading of the Holy Scriptures. For it is impossible that a man should attain salvation without perpetual exercise in reading spiritual things.' 'But some again will say, What if we cannot understand the things that are contained therein?' 'Why,' says he[4], 'even in that case, though you do

[4] Ibid. p. 62. (p. 739 b.) Τί οὖν, ἂν μὴ εἰδῶμεν τὰ ἐγκείμενά, φησι; Μάλιστα μὲν κἂν μὴ εἰδῆς τὰ ἐγκείμενα· ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀναγνώσεως πολὺς ὁ ἁγιασμὸς γίνεται· ἄλλως δὲ ἀδύνατον πάντα ἐπίσης ἀγνοεῖν. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ᾠκονόμησε χάρις τελώνας, καὶ ἁλιεῖς, καὶ σκηνοποιοὺς, καὶ ποιμένας, καὶ αἰπόλους, καὶ ἰδιώτας, καὶ ἀγραμμάτους, ταῦτα συνθεῖναι τὰ βιβλία, ἵνα μηδεὶς τῶν ἰδιωτῶν εἰς ταύτην ἔχῃ καταφεύγειν τὴν πρόφασιν, ἵνα πᾶσιν εὐσύνοπτα ᾖ τὰ λεγόμενα· ἵνα καὶ ὁ χειροτέχνης, καὶ οἰκέτης, καὶ ἡ χήρα γυνὴ, καὶ ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθέστατος, κερδάνῃ τε καὶ ὠφεληθῇ παρὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως. Οὐ γὰρ πρὸς κενοδοξίαν, καθάπερ οἱ ἔξωθεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀκουόντων ταῦτα πάντα συνέθηκαν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταξιωθέντες τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἔξωθεν φιλόσοφοι, καὶ ῥήτορες, καὶ συγγραφεῖς, οὐ τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον ζητοῦντες, ἀλλ' ὅπως αὐτοὶ θαυμασθεῖεν μόνον σκοποῦντες, εἴ τι καὶ χρήσιμον εἶπον, καὶ τοῦτο, καθάπερ ἐν ζόφῳ τινὶ τῇ συνηθεῖ [Sav. τῆς συνθήκης] ἀσαφείᾳ κατέκρυψαν. Οἱ δὲ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ Προφῆται τοὐναντίον ἅπαν ἐποίησαν· σαφῆ γὰρ καὶ δῆλα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῶν κατέστησαν ἅπασιν, ἅτε κοινοὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὄντες διδάσκαλοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ μανθάνειν δύνηται ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως μόνης τὰ λεγόμενα· καὶ τοῦτο προαναφωνῶν ὁ Προφήτης ἔλεγεν, Ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ· καὶ οὐ μὴ εἴπῃ ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, Γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον, ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν. Καὶ ὁ Παῦλός φησι· Κἀγὼ, ἀδελφοὶ, ἦλθον πρὸς ὑμᾶς, οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου, ἢ σοφίας, καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ πάλιν· Ὁ λόγος μου

not understand every thing that is contained therein, yet by reading you shall obtain much sanctification. For it is impossible that you should be equally ignorant of all things in those books. For the grace of the Spirit so ordered it, that they should originally be composed and written by publicans, and fishers, and tent-makers, and shepherds, and private and illiterate men, that none of the most ignorant and unlearned might have this excuse of difficulty to fly to; that the things there spoken might be easy to be looked into by all men; that the handy craftsman, the servant, the widow, the most illiterate and unlearned among men might reap benefit and advantage by hearing them read.' 'The Apostles and Prophets,' he says, 'wrote not like the philosophers of the Gentiles, in obscure terms, but made things plain to the understandings of all men, as being the common teachers of the world, that every man by himself might learn by reading alone the things that were spoken. To whom are not all things in the Gospel manifest and plain? Who is there, that hearing those sayings, "Blessed are the meek, blessed are the merciful, blessed are the pure in heart," and the like, would desire a teacher, to understand the meaning of them? Moreover, the signs, and miracles, and histories, are they not all intelligible and plain to any ordinary reader? This therefore is only a pretence, and excuse, and cloak for idleness. Thou

καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθανοῖς [Sav. πειθοῦς] ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει Πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως· καὶ πάλιν, Λαλοῦμεν γὰρ σοφίαν, φησὶν, οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων. Τίνι γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι δῆλα τὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἅπαντα; τίς δὲ ἀκούων, ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, διδασκάλου δεήσεται, ὥς τι μαθεῖν τῶν λεγομένων; ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν σημείων, καὶ θαυμάτων, καὶ ἱστοριῶν οὐχὶ καὶ τῷ τυχόντι γνώριμα, καὶ σαφῆ; Σκῆψις ταῦτα καὶ πρόφασις καὶ νωθείας παρακαλύμματα. Οὐ νοεῖς τὰ ἐγκείμενα; πῶς γὰρ δυνήσῃ νοῆσαί ποτε, μηδὲ ἁπλῶς ἐγκύψαι βουλόμενος; λάβε μετὰ χεῖρας τὸ βιβλίον· ἀνάγνωθι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἅπασαν· καὶ τὰ γνώριμα κατασχὼν, τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ ἀσαφῆ πολλάκις ἔπελθε· κἂν μὴ δυνηθῇς τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως εὑρεῖν τὸ λεγόμενον, βάδισον πρὸς τὸν σοφώτερον, ἐλθὲ πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον, ἀνακοίνωσαι περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων, πολλὴν ἐπίδειξαι τὴν σπουδήν. Κἂν ἴδῃ σε ὁ Θεὸς τοσαύτῃ κεχρημένον τῇ προθυμίᾳ, οὐ περιόψεταί σου τὴν ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ τὴν φροντίδα. Ἀλλὰ κἂν ἄνθρωπος μὴ διδάξῃ τὸ ζητούμενον, αὐτὸς ἀποκαλύψει πάντως. Ἀναμνήσθητι τοῦ εὐνούχου τῆς βασιλίδος Αἰθιόπων, ὃς, ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος ὢν, καὶ μυρίαις συνεχόμενος φροντίσι, καὶ πανταχόθεν πολλοῖς περικυκλούμενος πράγμασι, οὐκ εἰδὼς ἅπερ ἀνεγίνωσκεν, ὅμως ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀχήματος καθήμενος. Εἰ δὲ ἐν ὁδῷ τοσαύτην σπουδὴν ἐπεδείκνυτο, ἐννόησον τίς ἦν οἴκοι διατρίβων· εἰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ὁδοιπορίας οὐκ ἠνείχετο χωρὶς ἀναγνώσεως μένειν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καθήμενος· εἰ μηδὲν εἰδὼς ὧν ἀνεγίνωσκεν οὐκ

dost not understand the things contained in the Scripture. How shouldst thou understand them, when thou wilt not so much as look into them? Take the book into thy hands, read the whole history, and remember those things that are intelligible and easy; and those things, that are more obscure and dark, read over and over again: and if thou canst not by frequent reading dive into the meaning of what is said, go to a wiser person, betake thyself to a teacher, and confer with him about any such passage; show thy diligence and desire to be informed. And when God sees thy willingness and readiness of mind, he will not despise thy vigilance and care. But though man inform thee not in the things about which thou makest inquiry, he himself will certainly reveal it unto thee. Remember the eunuch of the Ethiopian queen, who, though he was a barbarian, and immersed in a multitude of cares and business, and understood not what he read, yet read for all that, sitting in his chariot. And if he showed so great diligence by the way, consider how he behaved himself at home. If he would not omit reading in the time of a journey, much less would he omit it when he sat quietly in his own house. If when he understood nothing of it, he still continued to read; much more would he do it when he came to understand it. Wherefore, because he read when he had no guide, he quickly found a guide. God knew the willingness of his mind, and accepted his diligence, and presently sent him a teacher. But Philip, you will say, does not now stand by us. No: but the Spirit, that moved Philip, is still by us. Let us not neglect our own salvation, beloved. These things were written for our salvation, upon whom the ends of the world are come. The

ἀφίστατο τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, πολλῷ μᾶλλον μετὰ τὸ μαθεῖν. Ὅτι γὰρ ἅπερ ἀνεγίνωσκεν οὐκ ᾔδει, ἄκουσον, τί φησιν αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος· Ἄραγε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; κἀκεῖνος ταῦτα ἀκούσας οὐκ ἠρυθρίασεν, οὐδὲ ᾐσχύνθη, ἀλλ' ὡμολόγησε τὴν ἄγνοιαν, καί φησι, Πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην, ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσῃ με; Ἐπεὶ οὖν, οὐδέπω τὸν ὁδηγοῦντα ἔχων, οὕτως ἀνεγίνωσκε, διὰ τοῦτο ταχέως ἐπελάβετο τοῦ χειραγωγοῦντος. Εἶδεν αὐτοῦ τὴν προθυμίαν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀπεδέξατο τὴν σπουδὴν, καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ διδάσκαλον εὐθέως. Ἀλλ' οὐ πάρεστιν ὁ Φίλιππος νῦν· ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ κινῆσαν τὸν Φίλιππον πάρεστι. Μὴ καταφρονῶμεν τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ἀγαπητοί. Ταῦτα πάντα ἐγράφη δι' ἡμᾶς πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντησε. Μεγάλη ἀσφάλεια πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν τῶν Γραφῶν ἡ ἀνάγνωσις· μέγας κρημνὸς καὶ βάραθρον βαθὺ τῶν Γραφῶν ἡ ἄγνοια· μεγάλη προδοσία σωτηρίας τὸ μηδὲν ἀπὸ τῶν θείων εἰδέναι νόμων· τοῦτο καὶ αἱρέσεις ἔτεκε· τοῦτο καὶ βίον διεφθαρμένον εἰσήγαγε· τοῦτο τὰ ἄνω κάτω πεποίηκεν.

reading of the Scriptures is our great guard against sin. Our ignorance of them is a dangerous precipice, and a deep gulf: it is an absolute betraying of our salvation, to know nothing of the Divine Law. It is this that has brought forth so many heresies; this that has brought so much corruption into our lives; this that has turned all things into confusion.'

One would think St. Chrysostom had foreseen all the little pleas and sophistry of the Romish Church, and was here disputing and inveighing against them: so apposite is every word to refute their trifling pretences; that ignorance is the mother of devotion; that the Scriptures are obscure; that there is need of an infallible guide on earth, besides the Spirit, to understand them; that the promiscuous use of them is the cause of all errors and heresies; that laymen and secular men are not fit to be entrusted with them: each of which positions is as plainly combated by St. Chrysostom, as if he had been directly disputing against the insufferable tyranny and frivolous pleas of the present Church of Rome: and his whole discourse, with some hundreds of the like passages that might be alleged out of him and other writers, does irrefragably show that it was as much the care and concern of the primitive Church to have the service of God and the Scriptures to be understood by all, as now it is the concern of the Roman Church to have them concealed from their knowledge, and locked up in a language which the unlearned do not understand.

Ninthly, From the liberty granted to children and catechumens to join in the public prayers, and read the Scriptures.

9. For it is very observable further, that in the primitive Church not only men and women, but children were encouraged and trained up from their infancy to the reading of the Holy Scriptures: and the catechumens were not only admitted to some of the prayers of the Church peculiarly appropriated to their condition, but also obliged to learn the Scriptures as part of their discipline and instruction. Of their obligation to learn the Scriptures we have treated before [5], in speaking of the method of training them up for baptism: and of their admission to certain prayers of the Church, we shall see more hereafter [6] in that part of the worship called *the service of the catechumens.* All then that is further here to be showed is, that children were trained up to the use of the Holy Scriptures.

[5] B. 10. ch. 1. ss. 6 and 7. v. 3. However it is observable, &c. pp. 446—448. Especially at p. 449.

[6] B. 14. ch. 5., in the next volume.

And of this we have undoubted evidence from many eminent instances of their practice. Eusebius[7] remarks of the great care of Leonides, the martyr, and father of Origen, in the education of his son, that he made him learn the Scriptures before he set him to the study of the liberal arts and polite learning. And Socrates[8] makes the like observation upon the education of Eusebius, surnamed Emisenus, who was born of noble parentage at Edessa, a city of Osrhoene in Mesopotamia, that he was first taught the Holy Scriptures from his infancy, and then human learning: and Sozomen[9] in relating the same story says, 'this was done *κατὰ πάτριον ἔθος*, *according to the custom of his country:*' which shows that it was no singular instance, but a general practice to bring children up from their infancy to the use of the Holy Scriptures. Gregory Nyssen notes it in the Life of his sister Macrina[10], 'that the first part of her instruction in her infancy was to be taught the easy portions of Scripture that were most suitable to her age:' and he says also[11], 'she did the same for her younger brother Peter, taking him from his mother's breasts, and instructing him in the Scriptures, that he might have no time to spend upon vain studies.' It is noted by Sozomen[12] and Palladius[13], of Marcus the hermit, that he was so expert in the Scriptures, when he was but a youth, that he could repeat all the Old and

[7] L. 6. c. 2. (v. 1. p. 258. 33.) *Οὐ μετρίως γοῦν καὶ περὶ ταύτας [Γραφὰς] ἐπεπόνητο, τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ πρὸς τῇ τῶν ἐγκυκλίων παιδείᾳ, καὶ τούτων οὐ κατὰ πάρεργον τὴν φροντίδα πεποιημένου· ἐξ ἅπαντος γοῦν αὐτὸν, πρὸς τῆς τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μαθημάτων μελέτης, ἐνῆγε τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐνασκεῖσθαι παιδεύμασιν· ἐκμαθήσεις καὶ ἀπαγγελίας ἡμέρας ἑκάστης αὐτὸν εἰσπραττόμενος.*

[8] L. 2. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 86. 5.) *Τίς δὲ οὗτος [Εὐσέβιος ἐπικληθεὶς Ἐμισηνὸς] ἦν, διδάσκει Γεώργιος ὁ Λαοδικείας, ὃς τότε παρῆν ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ. Φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ εἰς αὐτὸν πεπονημένῳ βιβλίῳ, ὡς εἴη Εὐσέβιος ἐκ τῶν εὐπατριδῶν τῆς ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ Ἐδέσης καταγόμενος· ἐκ νεάς τε ἡλικίας τὰ ἱερὰ μαθὼν γράμματα. εἶτα τὰ Ἑλλήνων παιδευθεὶς παρὰ τῷ τηνικαῦτα τῇ Ἐδέσῃ ἐπιδημήσαντι παιδευτῇ.*

[9] L. 3. c. 6. (ibid. p. 99. 17.) *Ἐκ νέου δὲ κατὰ πάτριον ἔθος τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἐκμαθὼν λόγους, κ. τ. λ.*

[10] Vit. Macrin. (t. 2. p. 179 b.) *Ὅσα τῆς θεοπνεύστου Γραφῆς εὐληπτότερα ταῖς πρώταις ἡλικίαις δοκεῖ, ταῦτα ἦν τῇ παιδὶ τὰ μαθήματα.*

[11] Ibid. (p. 185 d.) *Αὐτὸν παρὰ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν μετασχόντα εὐθὺς ἀποσπάσασα τῆς τιθηνουμένης, δι' ἑαυτῆς ἀνατρέπει τέ καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν ἤγαγε παίδευσιν, τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῶν μαθημάτων ἐκ νηπίων αὐτὸν ἐνασκήσασα, ὡς μὴ δοῦναι τῇ ψυχῇ σχολὴν, πρός τι τῶν ματαίων ἐπικλιθῆναι.*

[12] L. 6. c. 29. (ibid. p. 259. 29.) *Φασὶ δὲ Μάρκον μὴν, καὶ ἐν τῷ νέῳ τῆς ἡλικίας, εἰς ἄγαν πρᾶον καὶ σώφρονα, καὶ μνήμονα ἱερῶν Γραφῶν γενέσθαι.*

[13] Hist. Lausiac. c. 21. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 932 e.) *Μάρκος δὲ οὗτος, νεώτερος ὢν, παλαιὰν καὶ καινὴν Γραφὴν ἀπεστήθισεν.*—See also the latter part of n. 27, following.

New Testament without book. And it is observable, that as there were many catechetic schools in those times for explaining the Scriptures to the catechumens, so there were also schools appointed in many churches to instruct the youth in the knowledge of the Scriptures.

When Gregory, the Apostle of the Armenians, first converted that nation, it is said in his Life[14] that he set up schools in every city, and masters over them, by the king's command, to teach the Armenian children to read the Bible. And Theodoret[15] relates a remarkable story of Protogenes, the scribe, 'that when Valens, the Arian emperor, banished him to Antinoe in Thebais, in the utmost parts of Egypt, he, finding the greatest part of the city to be Heathens, set up a charity school among them, and taught them the Holy Scriptures; dictating to them in writing short-hand David's Psalms, and making them learn such doctrines of the apostolical writings as were proper for them to understand; by which means he brought many both of the children and parents over to the Christian faith.' And it has been observed before[16], that by the canons of some Councils such sort of charity schools were appointed to be set up in cathedrals and other churches, where no doubt, according to the custom of those days[17], children

[14] Act. Greg. ap. Sim. Metaphrast. Sept. 30., cited by Bishop Usher. [Hist. Dogmat. c. 2. cum Auctar. Wharton. (p. 18.) Ludos literarios construxit per omnes civitates; eisque doctores et magistros constituit, rege ita jubente, et ad hæc adjuvante, et pontificis animo magnam opem ferente. Publice quidem per civitates prædicatum fuit a pontifice, ut filii Armeniorum undique ad eos ventitarent, et sacras docerentur literas. Ed.]

[15] L. 4. c. 18. (v. 3. p. 169. 17.) *Πρωτογένης δὲ ὁ ἀξιάγαστος, τὰ Εὐνομίου* [al. *τὰ ἐκ νόμου* *] *γράμματα πεπαιδευμένος, καὶ γράφειν εἰς τάχος ἠσκημένος, τόπον εὑρῶν ἐπιτήδειον, καὶ τοῦτον διδασκαλεῖον καὶ παιδευτήριον ἀποφήνας, μειρακίων κατέστη διδάσκαλος καὶ κατὰ ταυτὸν γράφειν τε εἰς τάχος ἐδίδασκε, καὶ τὰ θεῖα ἐξεπαίδευσε λόγια· Δαυϊδικάς τε γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὑπηγόρευσε μελῳδίας, καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διδασκαλίας ἐκμανθάνειν τὰ πρόσφορα παρεσκεύαζεν, κ. τ. λ.*

[16] B. 8. ch. 7. s. 12. v. 3. p. 133.

[17] Vid. C. Gen. 6. c. 4. (t. 6. p. 1204 c.) Si quis ex presbyteris voluerit nepotem suum aut aliquem consanguineum ad scholas mittere in ecclesiis sanctorum, aut in cœnobiis, quæ nobis ad regendum commissa sunt, licentiam id faciendi concedimus.—C. 5. (ibid. d.) Presbyteri per villas et vicos scholas habeant. Et si quislibet fidelium suos parvulos ad discendas literas eis commendare vult, eos non renuant suscipere et docere, sed cum summa caritate eos doceant, attendentes illud quod scriptum est: *Qui autem docti fuerint, fulgebunt quasi splendor firmamenti: et qui ad justitiam erudiunt multos, fulgebunt quasi stellæ in perpetuas æternitates.*

* [Vide Valesium in locum. Ed.]

were taught to read the Scriptures. These rules were renewed in several Councils under Charles the Great and the following princes. Particularly in the second Council of Chalons[18], anno 813, it was appointed, 'that according to the order of Charles the Emperor, bishops should set up schools to teach both grammar and the knowledge of the Scriptures.' And in the Council of Toul, or Savonieres, in Lorrain, the decree was renewed[19], 'that schools of the Holy Scripture and human learning should be erected; forasmuch as by the care of the religious emperors in former days, by this means both ecclesiastical knowledge and human learning had made a considerable progress in the world.' And Mr. Wharton[20] will furnish the inquisitive reader with many other rules and canons made about the same time to promote and encourage the learning of the Scriptures.

Lastly, From the form and tenour of the ordination of readers in the Church.

10. I only observe one thing more, that the very form and tenour of the ordination of readers anciently did manifestly imply, that the service of the ancient Church was always performed in a known tongue. For they were sometimes ordained with prayer to God for his Holy Spirit, to qualify them to read his word to the instruction and edification of the people. The form of their ordination in the Book of the Constitutions[21] prays, 'that God would give the reader wisdom, as he did to Esdras, to read his laws to the people.' Now it is well known

[18] C. 3. (t. 7. p. 1272 e.) Oportet etiam, ut, sicut Dominus Imperator Carolus ..... præcepit, [episcopi] scholas constituant, in quibus et literaria [Labb. literas] solertia disciplinæ, et sanctæ Scripturæ documenta discantur.

[19] C. 10. (t. 8. p. 692 a.) Ut scholæ sanctarum Scripturarum, et humanæ quoque literaturæ, unde, annis præcedentibus, per religiosorum imperatorum studium magna illuminatio ecclesiæ et eruditionis utilitas processit, deprecandi sunt pii principes nostri, et omnes fratres et coëpiscopi nostri instantissime commonendi, ut ubicunque omnipotens Deus idoneos ad docendum, id est, fideliter et veraciter intelligentes donare dignetur, constituantur undique scholæ publicæ. Scilicet ut utriusque eruditionis, et divinæ scilicet et humanæ, in ecclesia Dei fructus valeat accrescere: quia, quod nimis dolendum est, et perniciosum maxime, divinæ Scripturæ verax et fidelis intelligentia jam ita dilabitur, ut vix ejus extrema vestigia reperiantur. Et idcirco ingenti cura et studio remedium procurandum est.

[20] Auctar. ad Usser. Hist. Dogmat. c. 4. (p. 346.) Postea vero cum ad conservandam S. Scripturæ et missæ publicæ intelligentiam, &c.

[21] L. 8. c. 22. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 409.) Ὁ σοφίσας Ἔσδραν τὸν θεράποντά σου ἐπὶ τὸ ἀναγινώσκειν τοὺς νόμους σου τῷ λαῷ σου· καὶ νῦν παρακαλούμενος ὑφ' ἡμῶν σόφισον τὸν δοῦλόν σου, καὶ δὸς αὐτῷ, ἔργον ἀκατάγνωστον διανύσαντα τὸ ἐγχειρισθὲν αὐτῷ, ἄξιον ἀνεδειχθῆναι μείζονος βαθμοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ.

how Esdras read the law to them, by causing them to understand the reading: "They read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." (Neh. 8, 8.) And if all readers read, as Esdras did, they certainly either read, or interpreted the reading, in a known tongue. For he rendered that, which was written in the Hebrew tongue, into the Chaldee or Syriac, which was after the captivity the common language of the people. Cyprian twice or thrice speaks of the ordination and office of readers, and he plainly intimates, that the people understood what they read out of the Gospel to them. In one place[22], speaking of Celerinus, the confessor, whom he had ordained a reader, he says, 'It was very fitting he should read the Gospel, who had so courageously and faithfully observed it; and that the same tongue, which had confessed the Lord, should be daily heard to repeat what the Lord hath spoken: since there was nothing wherein a confessor could more advantage his brethren, than to have them hear the Gospel read by the mouth of such a confessor and reader, whose faith was so brave an example.' In another Epistle[23], speaking of Aurelius, the confessor, whom he also ordained a reader, he says, 'There was nothing more agreeable, than that that voice, which had so gloriously confessed the Lord, should sound forth in reading the lessons of the Lord: and after those lofty words, whereby he proclaimed the martyrdom of Christ, he should read the Gospel of Christ which makes martyrs.' The Gospel was then so read, that the hearers might reap advantage by it, whilst they understood the doctrines and precepts that were read to them out of it. And such was the advantage, which some hearers in those days reaped from the benefit of having the Scriptures read in their own tongue, that it is very remarkable what is related of one or two of them, that being men of good memories, they got the Scriptures by heart, without any

[22] Ep. 34. [al. 39.] p. 77. (p. 224.).... Legat præcepta et evangelium Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur; vox Dominum confessa, in his quotidie, quæ Dominus locutus est, audiatur...Nihil est, in quo magis confessor fratribus prosit, quam ut, dum evangelica lectio de ore ejus auditor, lectoris fidem, quisquis audierit, imitetur.

[23] Ep. 38. [al. 33.] p. 75. (p. 222.).... Nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosa prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare; post verba sublimia, quæ Christi martyrium prolocuta sunt, evangelium Christi legere, unde martyres fiunt.

knowledge of letters, only by hearing them constantly read in the Church or elsewhere. St. Austin[24] remarks this of St. Anthony, the famous Egyptian monk, 'that without being able to read himself, he made such a proficiency in the knowledge of the Scriptures, as both by hearing them read to be able to repeat them, and by his own prudent meditation to understand them.' And Gregory the Great[25], gives a like instance in one Servulus, a poor man at Rome, who though he knew not a letter in the book, yet purchasing a Bible, and entertaining religious men, he prevailed with them to read it continually to him, by which means he perfectly learned the Holy Scriptures. It is a yet more astonishing instance, which Eusebius[26] gives in one of the martyrs of Palestine, a blind man, called John, who had so happy a memory, that he could repeat any part of the Bible as readily as others could read it. And he sometimes supplied the office of a reader in the Church; and he did this to so great perfection, that Eusebius says, 'when he first heard him, he was perfectly amazed, and thought he had heard one reading out of a book, till he came a little more curiously to examine him, and found that he did it only by the eyes of his understanding, having the Scriptures written not in books, or tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of his heart.'

These and such like examples, of which there are many[27] in

[24] De Doctr. Christ. in Prolog. t. 3. p. 3. (t. 3. part 1. p. 3 b. 1.)... Qui sine ulla scientia literarum Scripturas divinas, et memoriter audiendo tenuisse, et prudenter cogitando intellexisse prædicatur, &c.

[25] Hom. 15. in Evangel. t. 3. p. 40. [Ed. Bened. L. 1. in Evangel. Hom. 15.] (t. 1. p. 1491 b. 1.) Nequaquam literas noverat, sed Scripturæ sacræ sibimet codices emerat; et religiosos quosque in hospitalitatem suscipiens, hos coram se legere sine intermissione faciebat. Factumque est, ut quantum ad mensuram propriam attinet, plene sacram Scripturam disceret; cum sicut dixi, literas funditus ignoraret.

[26] De Martyr. Palæstin. c. 13. v. 1. p. 436. 17.) Ὅλας βίβλους τῶν θείων Γραφῶν οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις . . . ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν ὡς ἀληθῶς καρδίας σαρκίναις, ψυχῇ τε διανγεῖ καὶ καθαρωτάτῳ διανοίας ὄμματι καταγεγραμμένου· ὡς προφέρειν γε ὅτε καὶ βούλοιτο διὰ στόματος ὥσπερ ἀπό τινος λόγων θησαυροῦ, τοτὲ μὲν νομικὴν καὶ προφητικὴν γραφὴν, τοτὲ δὲ ἱστορικὴν, εὐαγγελικήν τε ἄλλοτε καὶ ἀποστολικήν. Καταπλαγῆναι ποτε αὐτὸς ὁμολογῶ, πρῶτον τὸν ἄνδρα θεασάμενος μέσον ἱκανοῦ πλήθους ἐκκλησίας ἑστῶτα, καί τινα μέρη θείας Γραφῆς διεξιόντα· ἕως μὲν γὰρ φωνῆς αὐτὸ μόνον ἐπακροᾶσθαί μοι παρῆν, ἀναγινώσκειν οἷα δὴ ἔθος ἐν ταῖς συνόδοις, τινὰ ἡγούμην· ὡς δὲ ἄγχιστα γενόμενος τὸ πραττόμενον συνεῖδον, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἅπαντας ὑγιέσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐν κύκλῳ περιεστῶτας· τοῦτον δὲ μόνοις τοῖς τῆς διανοίας χρώμενον, καὶ ἀτεχνῶς οἷά τινα προφήτην ἀποφθεγγόμενον.

[27] Vid. Pallad. Vit. Chrysost. c. 17. p. 156. (ap. Oper. Ed. Bened. t. 13. p. 62 c.) Ὁ δ' ἕτερος Ἀμμώνιος σὺν δυσὶν ἀδελφοῖς ἀσκη-

ancient story, are enough to raise in a man another sort of astonishment than that which Eusebius speaks of: I mean it would amaze a man to think, that there should be a Church in the world pretending to the height of purity and devotion, which yet runs counter to this indisputable practice of the ancient Church, whose public readers never once pretended to read any part of Scripture in an unknown tongue: that being as much against the design of their ordination, as it is against the design of the Scripture itself: for the one was written, and the other ordained to read what was written, for men's learning and instruction. Yea, the very form of ordaining readers, as it stands still in the Roman Pontifical, shows as much: for it is much ancienter than the corruption that is now crept into their service, and only stands there as a monument of their reproach, who oblige their readers to act directly contrary to the design of their office, and the very instructions that are given them in their ordination. For there[28] the bishop still, in conferring the order of readers, uses this form: 'Study to pronounce the Word of God, that is, the sacred lessons, distinctly and plainly to the understanding and edification of the faithful, without any error or falsehood; that ye may teach your hearers both by word and example.' This was a very proper form of exhortation to be given to readers at their ordination, while the ancient custom continued of reading in a known tongue: but now it is no better than mockery, to tell men they are obliged by the vow of their ordination to read the Scriptures to the understanding, and instruction, and edification of the people; and at the same time tie up their mouths, that they shall not read a word that may be understood, but it must all be in an unknown tongue.

This monstrous contradiction in their own practice one would think might bring men to see their error, and, what some in

ταῖς καὶ ἑνὶ ἐπισκόπῳ, οἱ καὶ κλοιοφορήσαντες ἐπὶ Οὐάλεντος, ἐξωρίσθησαν, ὡς πᾶσα ἐπιγινώσκει ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρεια, ἑξηκοντούτης· τοσοῦτοι ὄντες ἐν γνώσει, ὡς μηδὲν αὐτοὺς διαφεύγειν τῶν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπορουμένων.—Conf. Socrat. l. 7. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 369. 8.) Speaking of Theodosius Junior, he says, *Τὰ ἱερὰ πράγματα ἀπὸ στήθους ἀπήγγειλεν.*

[28] Pontifical. Roman. in capite, De Ordinat. Lectorum, [tit. 6. s. 2.] (t. 1. p. 81.) Studete verba Dei, videlicet lectiones sacras, distincte et aperte ad intelligentiam et edificationem fidelium absque omni mendacio falsitatis proferre.... Quatenus auditores vestros verbo pariter et exemplo docere possitis.

their communion [29] have been so long pleading for, oblige them to return to the useful and edifying practice of the primitive Church.

CHAP. V.

Of the original and use of liturgies, in stated and set forms of prayer in the Primitive Church.

Every bishop at liberty in the first ages, to order the form of divine service in his own church.

1. The next inquiry is concerning the ancient manner of performing divine service: whether they did it by stated liturgies, which we usually call *set forms of prayer*, or by unlimited liberty of prophesying and extempore conceptions?

The question about set forms of worship has more disturbed the present Church than any other: and yet after all there can be no public prayer, but it will be a set form, at least to the congregation. For though we suppose the minister to pray extempore, and vary the method, the form and the phrase every time he prays; yet to make it common prayer to a congregation, it will be a form to them, though a new form every time, in spite of all contradiction. And I have often wondered, that discerning men should not observe this, before they charged all forms of prayer as void of the Spirit, or a stinting of the Spirit: since if they were so, extemporary forms would be as much stinting the Spirit of the congregation as any other: and perhaps in some measure more so; since in stated forms, which every one knows beforehand, men may be supposed to make them their own hearty prayers by preceding meditation; whereas in extemporary forms every man must wait till he hears what is said, and then join in that form, or else not pray at all, but only privately by himself, not in any public or common prayer jointly with the rest of the congregation. For which reason I shall not here inquire simply, whether the public worship of the Ancients was by a form or no: since it is impossible there should be any public worship of a congregation, as a congregation, joining in common prayer to God, without having a common form dictated to them some way or

[29] Vid. Frederic. Fur. Cæriolan. Bononia, sive De Libris Sacris in Vernaculam convertendis. [Basil. 1555-6. 8vo. Liber prohibitus. Vid. Indic. Sotomajor. Madrit. 1667. fol. et Indic. Alexandr. VII. jussu edit. Romæ, 1667. p. 15. Ed.]

other for all to join in? But the question shall only be, whether they used stated forms of worship, or new extempore forms in every Church assembly? And here we must distinguish, 1. Between divine forms and forms of human institution. 2. Between ordinary and extraordinary occasions. 3. Between the times of extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and the times when those miraculous gifts abated.

Now there is no doubt to be made, but that the forms of divine institution were always used in the Church without any variation: as the form of baptism, the Lord's Prayer, the singing of David's Psalms, the forms of benediction, such as, The Lord be with you! The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.! The constant use of the form of baptism has been demonstrated already[30]. The use of the Lord's Prayer and the rest shall be showed hereafter[31]. As to forms of human institution, they were added by the bishops and governors of the Church according to their wisdom and discretion. And this with relation to the ordinary service. For still they were at liberty to compose new forms for extraordinary emergencies and occasions. And whilst the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit continued, there is little doubt to be made but that prayers and hymns, immediately dictated by the Spirit, made up a part of the ordinary service; still retaining such forms as were antecedently of divine appointment. When the extraordinary Spirit of prophecy ceased, then the rulers of the Church supplied this want by proper forms of their own composition, according to Christian prudence and discretion. And this seems to have been the true original of liturgies, or stated forms of divine service.

But why then have we none of these liturgies remaining entire and perfect to this day? I answer, there may be several reasons assigned for this. One is, that the bishops at first made every one their own liturgy for the private use, as we may call it, of their own particular Churches. And therefore the use of them not extending further than the precincts of their own dioceses, there was little knowledge of them beyond the bounds of those Churches, and not much care to preserve them but only for the uses of such Churches for which they were particularly designed. That every bishop had at first

[30] B. 11. ch. 3. ss. 1, 2. p. 26, of this volume. [31] Ch. 7, of this Book.

this power and privilege to compose and order the form of divine service for his own Church, I have shown in another place[32], where I had occasion to discourse of the independency of bishops, and their absolute power in their own Church: where, among other things, I observed, that as they had the privilege to word their own creeds, so they had the privilege to frame their own liturgy; which privilege they retained for several ages. As may be confirmed by this further and most certain observation; that when any new episcopal Church was taken and erected out of another, the new erected Church was not obliged to follow the model and prescriptions of the old Church, but might frame to herself a form of divine service agreeable to her own circumstances and condition. Of which Sozomen[33] gives a clear evidence in the instance of Maiuma, a city raised from a village in Palestine, and once belonging to the diocese of Gaza: for as soon as it was erected into a distinct episcopal see, it was no longer obliged to observe precisely the rules and forms of the Church of Gaza, but had, as he particularly remarks, a calendar for the festivals of its own martyrs, and commemorations of their own bishops and presbyters that had lived among them. Which is the same thing as to say, they had a liturgy and service of their own, independent of the Church out of which they were taken.

In after-ages the churches of a whole province by consent conformed to the liturgy of the metropolitan.

2. In after-ages bishops agreed by consent to conform their liturgy to the model of the metropolitical Church of the province to which they belonged. And then it was enacted into a law by several Councils, that the same order and uniformity should be observed in all Churches. The rudiments of this discipline were first laid in the French Churches. For in the Council of Agde a canon[34] was made about the year 506, 'that one and the same order should be equally observed in all Churches of the province in all parts of divine service.' And in the Council of Epone[35] it is more expressly said, 'that in celebrating divine offices, the provincial bishop should observe the same

[32] B. 2. ch. 6. t. 2. v. 1. p. 100.

[33] L. 5. c. 3. (v. 2. p. 184, 1.) . . . Ἑκατέρα γὰρ ἰδίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ κλῆρον ἔχει, καὶ πανηγύρεις μαρτύρων, καὶ μνείας τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένων ἱερέων.

[34] C. 30. (t. 4. p. 1388 b.) Et quia convenit ordinem ecclesiæ ab omnibus æqualiter observari, [al. custodiri] studendum est ut sicut ubique fit et post antiphonas, collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis vel presbyteris dicuntur, &c.

[35] C. 27. (ibid. p. 1579 c.) Ad ce-

order as was observed by the metropolitan.' And before these, the Council of Vannes[36] in Britanny, in the province of Tours, made a like order for that whole province, 'that one and the same custom in celebrating divine service, and the same order of psalmody should be kept in all Churches; that as they held one faith and confession of the Holy Trinity, so they should keep to one rule of divine offices; lest, if they varied in their observations, that variation should be interpreted as a disagreement in some point or other.' And the same rule was made and concerted in the Spanish Churches. For in the Council of Gironne, anno 517, a like decree[37] was made for the whole province of Tarragona or Catalonia, 'that the same order of mass, and custom in psalmody, and other ministrations, should be observed in all Churches of the province, as was observed in the metropolitical Church.' The fourth Council of Toledo[38] enlarged the order for uniformity in all the Churches of Spain and Gallicia, 'obliging all priests to perform divine offices in the same manner, that there might be no diversity among them, and that such difference might neither offend the weak, nor look like a schism in the Church to ignorant and carnal man.' Therefore they appointed, 'that one order should be observed in praying and singing, and the same method be kept in the morning and evening service, because they were all of the same faith and the same kingdom.' And the first Council of Braga has four or five canons[39] to the same purpose,

lebranda divina officia, ordinem, quem metropolitani tenent, provinciales eorum observare debebunt.

[36] C. 15. (ibid. p. 1057 a.) Rectum quoque duximus, ut vel intra provinciam nostram sacrorum ordo, et psallendi una sit consuetudo; ut sicut unam cum Trinitatis confessione fidem tenemus, unam et officiorum regulam teneamus: ne, variata observatione, in aliquo observatio [al. devotio] nostra discrepare videatur.

[37] C. 1. (t. 4. p. 1568 a.) Ut institutio missarum, sicut in metropolitana ecclesia agitur, ita in Dei nomine in omni Tarraconensi provincia tam ipsius missæ ordo, quam psallendo vel ministrando, consuetudo servetur. [Labbe's readings vary in terminations only, not in sense. Ed.]

[38] C. 2. (t. 5. p. 1704 a.) Placuit ut omnes sacerdotes, qui Catholicæ fidei unitatem complectimur, ut nihil ultra diversum aut dissonum in ecclesiasticis sacramentis agamus, ne quælibet nostra diversitas apud ignotos seu carnales schismatis errorem videatur ostendere, et multis exstet in scandalum varietas ecclesiarum. Unus igitur ordo orandi atque psallendi a nobis per omnem Hispaniam atque Galliciam [al. Galliam] conservetur; unus modus in missarum solennitatibus; unus in vespertinis officiis, nec diversa sit ultra in nobis ecclesiastica consuetudo, quia in una fide continemur et regno.

[39] C. 19. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 1.] (ibid. p. 840 b.) Placuit . . . . ut unus

appointing 'the same order of psalmody, and lessons, and salutations, and the same forms of celebrating baptism and the eucharist to be observed in all Churches.'

So that though every bishop at first had liberty to frame a liturgy for the use of his own Church, yet in process of time they agreed by consent to take the liturgy of the metropolitical Church as a standard for the whole province: and when the Roman empire began to be cantonized and divided into different kingdoms, then came in the use of national liturgies, whose use was commensurate to the bounds and limits of their respective nations and kingdoms.

Why none of the ancient liturgies are now remaining perfect and entire, as they were in their first original.

3. If it be inquired, Why then none of the ancient liturgies are now remaining as they were at first composed for the use of particular Churches? I answer, several reasons may be assigned for this. 1. The very liberty, which every bishop had to frame the liturgy of his own Church, was one reason why none of these are now remaining perfect and entire, as they were at first composed for the use of such a particular Church. For the design of them being only for the use of such a particular Church, there was no great reason to be very solicitous, either to communicate and diffuse the knowledge of them to other Churches, or to preserve them entire to posterity, who were not precisely tied up to the use of them, but might frame others at their own discretion. 2. It is not improbable, but that as a late learned French writer[40] has observed, the

atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur; et non diversæ ac privatæ, neque monasteriorum consuetudines cum ecclesiastica regula sint permixtæ. —C. 20. [al. 2.] (ibid. b.) Item placuit, ut per solennium dierum vigilias vel missas, omnes easdem et non diversas lectiones in ecclesia legant. —C. 21. [al. 3.] (ibid. c.) Item placuit, ut non aliter episcopi, et aliter presbyteri populum, sed uno modo salutent, dicentes, Dominus sit vobiscum: sicut in libro Ruth legitur: et ut respondeatur a populo, Et cum Spiritu tuo; sicut et ab ipsis Apostolis traditum omnis retinet Oriens, et non sicut Priscilliana pravitas permutavit.—C. 22. [al. 4.] (ibid. c.) Item placuit, ut eodem ordine missæ celebrentur ab omnibus, quem [al. quomodo] Profuturus, quondam hujus metropolitanæ ecclesiæ episcopus, ab ipsa apostolicæ sedis auctoritate suscepit scriptum.— C. 23. [al. 5.] (ibid. d.) Item placuit, ut nullus eum baptizandi ordinem prætermittat, quem et antea tenuit metropolitana Bracarensis ecclesia, et pro amputanda aliquorum dubietate, prædictus Profuturus episcopus scriptum sibi et directum a sede beatissimi Apostoli Petri suscepit.

[40] Renaudotius, Collectio Liturgiarum Orientalium, dissert. 1. c. 2. (t. 1. p. 9.) Orientales eandem disciplinam habentes, quæ reliquis Christianis communis erat, illam similiter in Oriente propagaverunt et posteris transmiserunt, neque tamen

ancient liturgies were for some ages only certain forms of worship committed to memory, and known by practice, rather than committed to writing, which is the only certain way of preserving such sort of monuments to late posterity. This seems very probable, because in the persecutions under Diocletian and his associates, though a strict inquiry was made after the books of Scripture, and other things belonging to the Church, which were often delivered up by the *traditores* to be burnt, yet we never read of any ritual books, or books of divine service, delivered up among them. Which is an argument, that their forms of worship and administration of the sacraments were not then generally committed to writing, or at least not compiled in books, distinct from the Psalms or other books of Scripture: otherwise it is very probable, that as the Scriptures, with other utensils and treasures of the Church, were often found by the Heathens, or betrayed by apostatizing Christians, and delivered up to be burnt; so we should have heard something of their books of divine worship undergoing the same fate: since they, who were so curious in inquiring after the cups, and lamps, and torches, and vestments and other utensils and vessels of the Church, as in some of their Calendars and Breviats we find they were, would hardly have omitted their books of worship, as being more proper objects of their spite and malice, had they found any such in the Christian Churches. Mr. Daille[41] argues well upon this foot against the use of images in the ancient Church, because no such thing was ever found or betrayed to the Heathen in the times of their most furious inquisition after any thing that related to the Christian Church or religion: and I think the argument will hold as well against having their liturgies compiled into books and volumes, since it is scarcely possible that such things in difficult times should have wholly escaped the notice and fury of their enemies.

statim illam perscripsisse videntur. Ut ita statuamus, facit insigne præ cæteris Basilii magni testimonium, qui multa, quæ ad nos sola traditione pervenerunt, enumerans, adjungit: *Verba sacræ invocationis in consecratione panis et calicis, quis sanctorum nobis scripto tradidit?*... Unde si non certo, saltem verisimiliter omnino concluditur, ante Basilii tempora liturgias Græcas literis non fuisse consignatas.

[41] De Cult. Relig. l. 1. c. 25. tot. (pp. 189, seqq.) [Consult especially from the words *Tantum ex illis, &c.* (p. 200.) and onwards. Ed.]

We are not hence to conclude, as some weak men might perhaps be inclined to do, that therefore they had no liturgies or set forms of divine worship in these persecuting ages of the Church; because there are undeniable evidences to the contrary, as we shall see by and by: but we are only to conclude that they did not so generally compile them in books as in after-ages, but used them by memory, and made them familiar to the people by known and constant practice, as many now use forms of prayer at this day without committing them to writing. And this is another reason why none of those ancient liturgies are come to our hands perfect and entire, but only in scattered fragments, as the Fathers had occasion to mention them incidentally in their writings. Nor need we wonder at this, since even those liturgies, which were most certainly compiled in books in the following ages, are now in a great measure lost also by the injuries of time, as the old Gallican, Spanish, African, and Roman liturgies, of which there is nothing but fragments and dismembered parcels now remaining. Which is a third reason why none of those ancient liturgies are exstant at this day. The fourth and last reason is the interpolations and additions made to the ancient liturgies in future ages. For though those ancient liturgies which go under the name of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, might originally have something of their composition in them, yet so many additions and alterations have been made in them by the Greek Church in following ages, that it is not easy to discern, after they have passed through so many hands, and so much new modelling, what was the genuine composition of the first authors. And therefore I have made little use of them in this work, but rather chosen to collect the fragments of the ancient liturgy from the scattered remains in the genuine writings of the Fathers; joining with them such forms as we find in the ancient book called the Apostolical Constitutions: which though it be not so ancient as the title pretends, nor of so venerable authority as Mr. Whiston[42] contends for, who would have it to be truly apostolical, yet it is owned to be a good collection of

[42] [See his 'Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, wherein it is proved that they are the most sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Testament,' in the third volume of his Primitive Christianity Revived, Lond. 1711–12. 8vo. Ed.]

the liturgy and rituals of the Church in the third and fourth centuries, and less corrupted than any other liturgy that bears the name of an ancient writer: the true reason of which was, because it never being of that esteem as to be used as a standing liturgy in any Church, the book came down to us with less alterations than other liturgies, which were new modelled according to the different taste and sentiments of the ages they passed through; as all things of this kind are commonly revised and altered by several hands when they are in constant use and practice. For proof of which we need go no further than the example of our own liturgy, which has received many reviews, alterations, and additions from the time it was first compiled in the days of King Edward VI. Upon this score those liturgies, which bear the names of ancient authors, are not to be depended on as the genuine, unmixed liturgies of those authors, having undergone so many alterations, interpolations, and additions by passing through various hands in succeeding ages. Forasmuch therefore as we have now no ancient liturgies perfect and entire, as they were first composed, we must take our accounts and estimate of them from other fountains: and by the Providence of God there is so much of them remaining in the genuine writings of the ancient Fathers, as both to show us in general that the Church made use of stated forms of worship, and also what was the particular order and method of her worship in the most considerable parts of her sacred service and devotions.

We will therefore first give some account of the use of liturgies and sacred rites in general, and then proceed to explain in order the several parts of the ancient service in the same natural method as we find it was performed, at several times, either in the daily or weekly assemblies for that purpose.

What forms used in the Apostles' days. Where of the ancient forms used in the Jewish worship, and of the new forms introduced into the Christian service.

4. As to the use of liturgies in general, I shall begin with the apostolical times, and carry the history through the four first ages. The apostolical practice may be considered in a double respect; first, in their compliance with the stated forms settled among the Jews, and secondly, in the new forms introduced into the Christian service.

As to the former, there seems to be nothing more uncontested among learned men, than that the Jews had set forms of worship in all parts of divine service, and that the Apostles

freely used these in all instances in which they thought it necessary or becoming to join with them. Their ordinary service was of two sorts, the service of the temple and the service of the synagogue. These differed in many respects, but both agreed in this, that the public prayers in both were offered up in a certain constant form of words. For their private prayers, which every man made particularly by himself, which were like those silent prayers we shall hereafter [42] meet with in the Christian Church, a late learned writer [43] tells us, they had no public forms to pray by, nor any public ministers to officiate to them therein; but all prayed in private conceptions: but their public prayers were directed by public forms both in the service of the temple and the synagogue. The temple-service is very accurately described by Dr. Lightfoot [44], as it stood in the time of our Saviour. The sum of his description is this:

First, before the offering of the sacrifice, the president called upon them to go to prayers, which they began with this form: 'Thou hast loved us, O Lord our God, with an everlasting love, with great and abundant compassion hast thou had mercy on us, O our Father, our King, for our fathers' sakes, who trusted in thee, and thou taughtest them statutes of life. So be gracious to us also, O our Father, O most merciful Father. O thou compassionate One, pity us; and put into our hearts to know, understand, obey, learn, teach, observe, do, and perform, all the words of the doctrine of thy law in love, and enlighten our eyes by thy law, and cause our hearts to cleave to thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and to fear thy name, &c.' After this prayer they rehearsed the Ten Commandments, and after the Ten Commandments they said over their phylacteries, in Hebrew called *tephillin*, which contained four portions of the Law written in four parchments. The first out of Exod. 13, from ver. 3 to 10. The second out of Exod. 13, from ver. 11 to 16. The third out of Deut. 6, from ver. 4 to 9. Tho fourth out of Deut. 11, from ver. 13

[42] See b. 15. ch. 1.

[43] Prideaux, Connection of Scripture History, part 1. b. 6. p. 382. (v. 2. p. 551., towards the end of ch. 3.) And the same hours, &c. [See also what is said on the *proseuchæ*, (ch. 4. p. 556.) .... But in the *proseuchæ* they prayed as in the temple, every one apart for himself, &c. Ed.]

[44] Temple-Service, ch. 9. s. 4. p. 108. (v. 9. p. 112.) Their public prayers, &c.

to 21. After this prayer and rehearsal of the Decalogue and of their phylacteries, at the time of offering incense they had three or four prayers more[45]; the first of which was in this form, referring to their phylacteries: 'Truth and stability, and firm, and sure, and upright, and faithful, and beloved, and lovely, and delightful, and fair, and terrible, and glorious, and ordered, and acceptable, and good, and beautiful, is this word for us for ever and ever. The truth of the Everlasting God our King, the Rock of Jacob, the Shield of our salvation, for ever and ever. He is sure, and his name sure, and his throne settled, and his kingdom and truth established for evermore, &c.'

The second prayer was in this form: 'Be pleased, O Lord our God, with thy people Israel, and with their prayer, and restore the service to the oracle of thy house, and accept the burnt-offering of Israel, and their prayer in love and complacency; and let the service of thy people Israel be continually well-pleasing unto thee.' And they concluded thus: 'We praise thee, who art the Lord our God, and the God of our Fathers, the God of all flesh, our Creator and the God of all creatures: glory and praise be to thy great and holy name, because thou hast preserved and kept us; so preserve and keep us, and bring back our captivity to the courts of thy holiness, &c.'

A third prayer ran thus: 'Appoint peace, goodness, and blessing, grace, mercy, and compassion for us, and for all Israel thy people. Bless us, O our Father, even all of us as one man, with the light of thy countenance: for in the light of thy countenance thou, O Lord our God, hast given us the law of life, and loving mercy and righteousness, and blessing and compassion, and life and peace: let it please thee to bless thy people Israel at all times. Let us and all thy people the house of Israel be remembered and written before thee in the book of life, with blessing and peace, &c.'

A fourth prayer was used on the Sabbath as a blessing, by the course that went out of their service, upon those that came in to do the service of the following week, in these words: 'He, that caused his name to dwell in this house, cause love and brotherhood, and peace, and friendship, to dwell among you.'

[45] Ibid. s. 6. (p. 116.) Besides the prayers, &c.

After these things, the priests lifted up their hands and blessed the people in that form of words, which is in Numb. 6, 24. 'The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.' To which the people answered, 'Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting.'

After this blessing, the meat-offering, and the drink-offering was offered, and then began the singing of psalms and the music. The constant and ordinary psalms which they sung were these[46]:

On the first day of the week, the 24th Psalm, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, &c."

On the second day, the 48th Psalm, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of God, &c."

On the third day, the 82nd Psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, and judgeth among gods, &c."

On the fourth day, the 94th Psalm, "O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth, &c."

On the fifth day, the 81st Psalm, "Sing aloud unto God our strength, make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob, &c."

On the sixth day, the 93rd Psalm, "The Lord reigneth, He is clothed with majesty, &c."

On the Sabbath day they sang the 92nd Psalm, which bears the title of '*A psalm or song for the Sabbath day*,' both in the Hebrew Bibles and the translation of the Septuagint.

These were the known and constant and fixed Psalms for the several days of the week throughout the year[47]. But upon some certain days they had additional psalms and hymns. For on the Sabbath, as there was an additional sacrifice appointed; (Numb. 28, 9.) so at the time of this additional sacrifice, the Levites sang the Song of Moses, (Deut. 32.) "Hear, O heavens, and I will speak," which they divided into six Sabbaths for the morning service: and at the evening service they sang that other Song of Moses, (Exod. 15.) "I will sing unto the Lord, for he triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea, &c." By which custom of singing the

[46] Ibid. ch. 7. s. 2. (p. 62.) The constant, &c.

[47] Ibid. s. 2. (p. 65.) On the Sabbaths, &c.

Songs of Moses upon the Sabbath, Dr. Lightfoot observes[48], that that passage in Rev. 15, 3, may be illustrated, where the saints are said to "sing the Song of Moses, the servant of God:" because they were now come to their everlasting Sabbath, having gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and having the harps of God in their hands. Which allusion to the Sabbath-service in the time of St. John is a good argument for the antiquity of the practice.

Besides this, there was an additional sacrifice appointed on the first day of the year, called the Feast of Trumpets, (Numb. 29, 1.) and at this time they sang the 81st Psalm, "Sing aloud unto God our strength, &c." And at the evening service of this day, the 29th Psalm, "The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness, &c."

Also at the Passover, besides many other forms, they were used to sing the hymn called the Egyptian Hallel, because it was sung in remembrance of their delivery out of Egypt; which consisted of the 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, and 118th Psalms. And this, as some[49] observe, was sung also at the beginning of every month, and on the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. And the latter part of it is generally supposed to be the hymn which our Saviour sung with his disciples at the conclusion of his last supper.

This is the sum of the Jewish temple-service, as it stood in our Saviour's time, with which, notwithstanding its stated forms, both he and his disciples complied, whenever they had occasion upon any such solemnities to frequent the temple.

The service of the synagogue was something different from that of the temple. For here were no sacrifices, but only these three things: 1. Prayers. 2. Reading of the Scriptures. 3. Preaching and expounding upon them. Their public prayers, like those of the temple, were all by stated forms. Among these, the most ancient and solemn were those which are called *Shemoneh Eshreh*, that is, *The Eighteen Prayers*, which are

[48] Ibid. (p. 61.) And the consideration of this helpeth to illustrate, &c.

[49] Otho, Lexicon Rabbinicum. (p. 236.) Cantabatur etiam in principio mensis, in festo Dedicationis, in festo Septimanarum, et festo Paschatis.

said to have been appointed by Ezra and the great synagogue from the time of the Captivity. These have been lately translated and published by Dr. Prideaux in his Connexion of Scripture History[49], which, because it is a work that deserves to be in every one's hands, I shall not here transcribe, but refer the reader thither for the knowledge of them. Only, whereas he observes rightly, that another prayer, called *The Nineteenth*, was added a little before the destruction of Jerusalem, against the Christians, who are therein meant under the names of apostates and heretics; I shall confirm his observation from a passage in Epiphanius[50], who tells us that the Jews in their synagogues were used to pray against the Christians in this form: Ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους, *O God, curse the Nazarenes!* And the same thing is intimated by Justin Martyr[51], who says, 'Immediately after our Saviour's resurrection the Jews sent forth their chosen emissaries to all the synagogues in the world, to tell them that there was a certain impious, lawless sect, risen up under one Jesus, a Galilean impostor, whom they had crucified, but his disciples came by night, and stole him away out of the grave, and deceived men by saying he was risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven:' and he adds, 'that after their city was demolished they repented not, but even dared καταρᾶσθαι αὐτοῦ, *to curse him*, and all that believed on him.' Which plainly refers to this additional prayer inserted into their liturgy against the Christians. But excepting this prayer, which was of later date, all the other seem to have been in use in the time of our Saviour and his Apostles. And as we are sure they frequented the syna-

[49] Part 1. b. 6. p. 375. (v. 2. pp. 538, seqq.) The most solemn part of their prayers are those which they call *Shemoneth Eshreh*, i. e. The Eighteen Prayers, &c.

[50] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 9. (t. 1. p. 124 c.)

[51] Dialog. cum Tryph. (p. 335 c.) Οὐ μόνον οὐ μετενοήσατε, μαθόντες αὐτὸν ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀλλ', ὡς προεῖπον, ἄνδρας χειροτονήσαντες ἐκλεκτοὺς, εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπέμψατε κηρύσσοντας, ὅτι αἵρεσίς τις ἄθεος καὶ ἄνομος ἐγήγερται ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τινὸς Γαλιλαίου πλάνου· ὃν σταυρωσάντων ἡμῶν, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κλέψαντες αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήματος νυκτὸς, ὁπόθεν κατετέθη ἀφηλωθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, πλανῶσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους λέγοντες, ἐγηγέρθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνεληλυθέναι.. Καὶ ἁλούσης ὑμῶν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρημωθείσης, οὐ μετανοεῖτε, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταρᾶσθαι αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς αὐτὸν πάντων τολμᾶτε. [Conf. Hieron. in Esai. 5, 18. (t. 4. p. 81 d.).... Et ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazaræorum anathematizant Judæi nomen Christianum. Ed.]

gogues, so there is no doubt to be made but that they joined in these usual forms of prayer, which were one part of the synagogue-service.

The other parts of this service were, the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and expounding of them to the people. Which was also done by a certain rule and order. For the Five Books of Moses were divided into as many sections or lessons, as there are weeks in the year, one of which was read every Sabbath, and half of the same every Monday and Thursday, which were their days of assembly for the synagogue service. At these our Saviour was usually present, and sometimes assisted and officiated in reading, according to custom, as a member of the synagogue, as is expressly said of him, (Luke 4, 16.) and at other times taught in their synagogues, (Mark 1, 39. Luke 4, 15 and 44.) which is also noted of St. Paul, (Acts 13, 15. and 16, 13. and 17, 2. and 18, 4.) that it was his manner on the Sabbath-days to go into the synagogues, where prayer was wont to be made, and there, after the reading of the Law and the Prophets, to preach to the people, and dispute or reason with them. So that notwithstanding the public service of the synagogue was all performed by order and form, yet this was no reason to the Apostles to refrain from it, as a thing simply sinful or unlawful; but they complied with it for some time, probably to gain upon the Jews the better, and make them lay aside their prejudices against the Christian doctrine.

But besides their compliance with the stated forms of the Jewish liturgy and worship, they had some forms of their own in constant use among themselves. Among which we may safely venture to reckon, 1. The Lord's Prayer, as a form appointed by Christ to be used by all his disciples; of which the primitive Christians never made any dispute, as we shall see more fully hereafter. 2. The form of baptism constantly used without any variation, as has been showed in a former Book [52]. 3. The forms of professing their faith in baptism, or the forms of sound words settled in every Church. 4. The forms of renouncing Satan, and covenanting with Christ in baptism. 5. The forms of Scripture-hymns and psalms, and glorifications of God. To which the Ancients seem to add,

[52] B. 11. ch. 3. ss. 1, 2. pp. 26–30, of this volume.

6. The forms of benediction, such as, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." And lastly, the repetition of the history of Christ's institution of the last Supper, as a necessary part of consecration, which together with the use of the Lord's Prayer in the celebration of the eucharist is generally thought to descend from apostolical practice. These things are sufficient to show, that even the Apostles themselves, notwithstanding the extraordinary gift of inspired prayer, whether in matter, or method, or words, or languages, sometimes confined themselves to forms, without any reflection on their gifts, or stinting of the Spirit, or want of edification to their hearers. If these things be rightly considered, some of them at least will evince, that the use of well chosen and well appointed forms, are no ways disagreeable to apostolical practice, since the Apostles themselves both complied with the forms in use in the Jewish temple and synagogue and used some others of Christian institution. I now proceed to carry this inquiry through the three or four following ages of the Church.

And here, first, we may add what Josephus[53] says of the Essenes, 'that they were used to rise before the sun was up and offer unto God *πατρίους τινὰς εὐχὰς, certain prayers according to the custom of their forefathers*, or such as they had received from them:' and what Philo[54] says of the *Therapeutæ* of Alexandria, the *Ascetics*, whether Jews or Christians, that lived there in his time, 'that the president among them, after he had made a sermon, first began to sing an hymn to the praise of God, either such as he had composed himself, or one taken out of the ancient Prophets, in the close of which they all, both men and women, joined in concert with him.' Again in their vigils[55] they divided themselves into two choirs

[53] De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 12. [juxt. Ed. Huds. c. 8. n. 3.] (v. 2. p. 1061. 17.) Πρός γε μὴν τὸ θεῖον ἰδίως εὐσεβεῖς. Πρὶν γὰρ ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον, οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβήλων· πατρίους δέ τινας εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχὰς ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι.

[54] De Vit. Contemplat. t. 2. p. 1214. (Mangey. t. 2. p. 484. 10.).... Ἔπειτα [ὁ πρόεδρος] ἀναστὰς ὕμνον ᾄδει πεποιημένον εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, ἢ καινὸν αὐτὸς πεποιηκὼς, ἢ ἀρχαῖόν τινα τῶν πάλαι ποιητῶν. .... Ὁπότε τὰ ἀκροτελεύτια καὶ ἐφύμνια ᾄδειν δέοι, τότε ἐξηχοῦσι πάντες τε καὶ πᾶσαι.

[55] Ibid. t. 2. p. 1215. (Mangey, ibid. 33.) Ἀνίστανται πάντες ἀθρόοι, καὶ κατὰ μέσον τὸ συμπόσιον δύο γίνονται τὸ πρῶτον χοροὶ, ὁ μὲν ἀνδρῶν, ὁ δὲ γυναικῶν· ἡγεμὼν δὲ καὶ ἔξαρχος αἱρεῖται καθ' ἕτερον ἐντιμότατός τε καὶ ἐμμελέστατος· εἶτα ᾄδουσι πεποιημένους εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ὕμνους πολλοῖς μέ-

the one of men, the other of women, each of which had their precentor, and so they sang hymns to the glory of God, composed in divers sorts of metre, sometimes one side singing and sometimes the other, in imitation of the children of Israel, under the conduct of Moses and Miriam, their precentors, at the Red sea. This was so much a resemblance of the ancient Christian way of psalmody, that Eusebius [56], who transcribes a great many things out of this curious tract of Philo, was clearly of opinion, that it was a description of the worship of such Jews as had embraced the Christian religion: in which opinion he is followed not only by St. Jerome [57], but by many learned writers of this last age also. I shall not need to determine this question, whether they were Jews or Christians: it is sufficient to our present purpose, that their way of worshipping God by certain forms of praise, and those of human composition, was the same, or so much alike, that it was not easy to distinguish the one from the other.

What evidence there is of the use of set forms in the second century.

5. In the beginning of the second century lived Pliny, a Roman proconsul in Bithynia, who, giving Trajan the Emperor an account of the Christian way of worship, which he had from the mouth of some apostates, says [58], 'They were used to meet on a certain day before it was light, and sing an hymn alternately to Christ as God, binding themselves by an oath or sacrament, not to any wicked thing, but that they would not steal, nor rob, nor commit adultery, nor break their faith, nor

τροις καὶ μέλεσι, τῇ μὲν συνηχοῦντες, τῇ δὲ καὶ ἀντιφώνοις ἁρμονίαις ἐπιχειρονομοῦντες καὶ ἐπορχούμενοι, καὶ ἐπιθειάζοντες· τοτὲ μὲν τὰ προσόδικα, τοτὲ δὲ τὰ στάσιμα, στροφάς τε τὰς ἐν χρείᾳ καὶ ἀντιστροφὰς ποιούμενοι· εἶτα, ὅταν ἑκάτερος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἰδίᾳ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν ἰδίᾳ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἑστιαθῇ, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς βακχείαις, ἀκράτου σπάσαντες τοῦ θεοφιλοῦς ἀναμίγνυνται, καὶ γίνονται χορὸς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, μίμημα τοῦ πάλαι συστάντος κατὰ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν, ἕνεκα θαυματουργηθέντων ἐκεῖ· τὸ γὰρ πέλαγος προστάξει Θεοῦ, τοῖς μὲν σωτηρίας αἴτιον, τοῖς δὲ πανωλεθρίας ἐγίνετο [al. *γίνεται.*]

[56] L. 2. c. 17. tot. et præsertim ultima verba. (v. 1. p. 70. 14.) *Ὅτι δὲ τοὺς πρώτους κήρυκας τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας, τά τε ἀρκῆθεν πρὸς τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἔθη παραδεδομένα καταλαβὼν ὁ Φίλων ταῦτ' ἔγραφε, παντί τῳ δῆλον.*

[57] De Scriptor Eccles. c. 21. (t. 2. p. 833.) Exstant hujus præclara et innumerabilia opera.... et de vita nostrorum liber unus, de quo supra diximus, id est, de apostolicis viris, quem et inscripsit *Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ Ἱκετῶν*, &c.

[58] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 278.)..... Quod essent soliti, stato die, ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati negarent.

withhold the pledge.' The word *carmen dicere*, which Pliny uses, will signify *a solemn form of prayer*, as well as *praises*, as Vossius [59] and Brissonius [60] have observed out of the Roman writers: and then it will denote, that their whole divine service was by a stated form. However in the most restrained sense it implies, that they used certain forms in some part of their service in their alternate hymnody, which could not otherwise be performed but by composition and prescription. And that makes it probable, that the rest of their service was then of the same nature and order.

In the beginning of the same century Ignatius is said by the ancient historians [61] to have brought in the way of alternate singing into the Church of Antioch; that is, hymns sung alternately to the praise of the Holy Trinity. For they speak not of the alternate singing of David's Psalms, as introduced by Ignatius, but of hymns composed by him to set forth the divinity of Christ: which appears to have been a very ancient practice, not only from what has been already observed out of

[59] Comment. in loc. p. 97. (Oper. Amstel. fol. t. 4. opuscul. p. 59. col. sinistr.) Dixerunt carmen, atque id Christo. Carmen fuerit, etiamsi non caneretur. Nam *carmen* vocarunt Romani, quidquid conceptis verbis diceretur.

[60] De Formulis, l. 1. (p. 97.) Enimvero in ea votorum nuncupatione, quæ a censoribus lustrum condentibus fiebat, invenio ante Scipionis ætatem solemni carmine Deos oratos, *ut populi Rom. res meliores amplioresque facerent.* Quod ab Africano emendatum, institutumque deinceps rogari, *ut eas res perpetuo incolumes servarent*, Valerius Max. Libr. 4. me docuit, cujus ipsamet verba apponam. *Africanus cum censor lustrum conderet, in quo solito sacrificio scriba ex publicis tabulis solemne ei precationis carmen prœiret, quo dii immortales, ut populi Rom. res meliores facerent, rogabantur*, &c.—Ibid. (p. 64.) Solemne utique fuisse aliquod carmen precationis, quod in concionibus, quæ ad populum habebantur, magistratus præfari consueverant, Livius, l. 39. docet his verbis; *Ad hæc officia dimissis magistratibus, consules in rostra ascenderunt; et, concione advocata, cum solemne carmen precationis, quod præfari, priusquam populum alloquantur, magistratus solent, peregisset, consul ita cœpit*, &c.

[61] Vid. Socrat. l. 6. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 322. 30.) Λεκτέον δὲ καὶ ὅθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ἡ κατὰ τοὺς ἀντιφώνους ὕμνους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συνήθεια. Ἰγνάτιος Ἀντιοχείας τῆς Συρίας, τρίτος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Πέτρου ἐπίσκοπος, ὃς καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῖς συνδιέτριψεν, ὀπτασίαν εἶδεν ἀγγέλων, διὰ τῶν ἀντιφώνων ὕμνων τὴν Ἁγίαν Τριάδα ὑμνούντων, καὶ τὸν τρόπον τοῦ ὁράματος τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρέδωκεν.—Cassiodor. Hist. Tripart. l. 10. c. 9. (t. 1. p. 331.) Dicendum tamen est, unde sumpsit initium, ut in ecclesia antiphonæ decantentur. Ignatius Antiochiæ Syriæ tertius post Apostolum Petrum episcopus, qui etiam cum ipsis degebat Apostolis, vidit angelorum visionem, quomodo per antiphonas Sanctæ Trinitati dicebant hymnos. Isque modum visionis Antiochenæ tradidisse probatur ecclesiæ. Et ex hoc ad cunctas transivit ecclesias.

the account given by Pliny [62], but from what is said by that ancient author in Eusebius, who wrote against the heresy of Artemon in the latter end of the second century; where, among other arguments which he brings for the Church's constant belief of our Saviour's divinity, he urges this for one, 'that from the beginning there were psalms and hymns composed by the brethren, and written by the faithful, setting forth the praises of Christ as the Word of God, and declaring the divinity of his Person.' Among these hymns we may reckon those of Ignatius, composed for the service of the Church of Antioch, which probably might continue in use till Paulus Samosatensis removed them out of the Church, and introduced others in their room, as the Fathers of the Council of Antioch, mentioned in Eusebius [63], object against him. It is not improbable likewise, but that Ignatius, as he made hymns, so might compose a whole form of prayers for the use of his own Church, as was customary for bishops to do in those days. To which custom he seems to refer in his Epistle to the Magnesians [64], when he bids them 'do nothing without the bishops and the presbyters; nor attempt any thing seemingly agreeable to their private fancies: but, when they met together, to have one prayer and one supplication.' Which not only forbids them to break out and divide into schisms and separate assemblies, but also to conform to the order of prayers agreed upon by the bishop and presbytery of the Church.

Not long after Ignatius, we meet with collateral evidence of Lucian the Heathen, who had some knowledge of the Christian service. For in one of his Dialogues [65], describing his coming into a religious assembly, he says, 'he there heard that prayer which began with the Father, and ended with the hymn of many names.' It is more than probable, that by 'the prayer

[62] L. 5. c. 28. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 329. n. 28.

[63] L. 7. c. 30. See before ibid. n. 29.

[64] N. 7. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 58.) Μηδὲ πειράσητε εὔλογόν τι φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ, μία δέησις. [The reading according to Cotelerius is as follows:—Μηδὲ τι φαινέσθω ὑμῖν εὔλογον παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην· τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον παράνομον καὶ θεοῦ ἐχθρόν· πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ἅμα συνερχεσθε· μία δέησις ἔστω κοινὴ, εἷς νοῦς, μία ἐλπὶς κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[65] Philopatr. p. 1128. (Ed. Bipont. v. 9. p. 265.) . . . Τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἀρξάμενος, καὶ τὴν πολυώνυμον ὠδὴν εἰς τέλος ἐπιθείς.

beginning with the Father,' he means the Lord's Prayer, which was of known and general use in the eucharistical service, but it is not so clear what he means by 'the hymn of many names,' that came after it. Bp. Wettenhall[66] takes it for the lesser or common doxology, Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost! Dr. Smith[67] and others for the great doxology, Glory be to God on high! which I think more probable: though it is not necessary in our present inquiry to determine what hymn it was: it being sufficient to our purpose, that he speaks of some prayers and hymns then of such common and vulgar use in the Church-worship, as that they were known to the very Heathens.

Justin Martyr's authority is commonly alleged on both sides, both for and against liturgies. The defenders of prescribed forms urge his mentioning[68], *κοινὰς εὐχὰς, common prayers.* The opposers with great vehemence argue for extempore prayer, because, he says[69], the bishop offered prayers and thanksgivings, *ὅση δύναμις, with all his might and power.*

Now to speak freely, I think there is no demonstration in either of these expressions: for they are both ambiguous. *Common prayer* does not always imply, that the minister prayed by a prescribed form: for inspired prayer was doubtless common prayer, when offered in a public congregation; and though it was then a form prescribed to the people, yet it was not so to the minister: but conceived by immediate inspiration. Therefore we cannot argue barely from the mentioning of common prayer, that the minister prayed by a prescribed form, unless it be added, as usually it is in Chrysostom, that the congregation prayed *μιᾷ φωνῇ, with one voice,* joining vocally in the whole prayer, or alternately by way of responses,

[66] Gift of Singing, ch. 2. (p. 273.) And the same may be concluded touching that doxology, so usual in our liturgy, &c.

[67] Account of the Greek Church. (p. 226.) This I conjecture to be the *ᾠδὴ πολυώνυμος,* &c.—Comber, Origin of Liturgies, part 1. ch. 2. (p. 30.) takes it for the *Trisagion.*

[68] Apol. 2. (p. 97 b.) *Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον, . . .ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος, καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως, κ. τ. λ.*

[69] Ibid. (p. 98 e.) *Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν. Καὶ, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ οἶνος, καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις, αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν.*

with the minister. For that implies, that the people understood beforehand the words of their common prayers, before they were uttered by the minister. On the other hand there is no solidity in the argument brought against liturgies, from Justin's saying, that the bishop prayed and gave thanks, ὅση δύναμις, *with all his ability or power.* For this may not at all relate to the invention of words, but to the ardency and intenseness of devotion, which may be in the use of prescribed forms, as well as those of immediate conception. And so it is plain the very same phrase is used by Nazianzen, when he exhorts[70] the Christians to sing ὅση δύναμις, *with all their might,* that triumphal hymn upon the death of Julian, which the children of Israel sang when the Egyptians were drowned in the Red sea. Which was not an extempore hymn, but a form composed by Moses, and appointed to be sung alternately by the congregation of Israel. (Exod. 15.) So that after all the pains that have been taken by some late writers to draw an argument against liturgies out of this passage of Justin, there is no reason for such a conclusion: and yet this is the only passage that is brought against them. But it is more material to consider, that Justin lived among the Jews, who certainly used set forms of prayer, one of which he condemns, as I have showed before[71], as an execration inserted against the Christians, but says nothing against the other, which yet doubtless he would have done, had he believed the use of liturgies to have been only a piece of Jewish superstition, unbecoming the spirit of a Christian. But he too well understood the practice of our Saviour and his Apostles, in complying with the forms of the Jewish service, to put any such mark or brand of infamy upon them. And therefore this is of more weight with me, to persuade that Justin believed the known forms both of the Jewish and Christian service to be lawful, than any ambiguous expressions are to persuade the contrary.

Not long after Justin lived Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in

[70] Greg. [Orat. 3.] Invect. 1. cont. Julian. (t. 1. p. 54 b.) Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνεκαθήραμεν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ χοροῦ τὸ πλήρωμα· φέρε, ὅση δύναμις, ἁγνισάμενοι καὶ σώματα καὶ ψυχάς· καὶ μίαν ἀναλαβόντες φωνὴν, ἑνὶ συναρμοσθέντες πνεύματι, τὴν ἐπινίκιον ᾄδωμεν ἐκείνην ᾠδὴν, ἥν ποτε ᾖσεν ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ κατακαλυφθεῖσιν, ἐξαρχούσης Μαρίας, καὶ ἀνακρουομένης τὸ τύμπανον.

[71] S. 4. n. 51, preceding.

France. And he takes notice of a certain form used in the Christian worship, so well known to the Valentinian heretics, that they made use of it as an argument to prove their own fabulous doctrine of the *Æones:* 'for,' said they[71], 'you yourselves of the Church in your thanksgivings say, *for ages of ages*, or *œones of œones;* thereby intimating the *œones* which we contend for.' This plainly refers to some form of thanksgiving then of known use in the Church. Dr. Comber and some others take it for the *Gloria Patri*, because it ends as that in Irenæus did, with the words, 'world without end. Amen.' But I rather conceive with Dr. Grabe[72], that it was the conclusion of the great thanksgiving in the eucharist, where the glorification of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, ends with the words *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· world without end!* to which the people always answered, Amen! As appears from the form remaining in the Constitutions[73], of which more in its proper place.

About the same time lived Clemens of Alexandria, who, speaking of the Church[74], says, 'it was the congregation of those, who prostrated themselves in prayers, having, as it were, *φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν, one common voice.*' Which implies, that their prayers were such as that they could join vocally in them, either by repeating the whole, or at least by alternate responses. He also mentions a form of prayer used over

[71] Ap. Iren. l. 1. c. 1. (p. 15. 20.) *Καὶ τὸν Παῦλον φανερώτατα λέγουσι τοὺς Αἰῶνας ὀνομάζειν πολλάκις, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν τετηρηκέναι οὕτως εἰπόντα, Εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς, ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας λέγοντας, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκείνους τοὺς αἰῶνας σημαίνειν.*

[72] Not. in loc. Irenæi. (ibid. ad calc. p. 16. n. 2.) Non inepte notat Feuard. per *eucharistias* hic intelligi preces atque laudes, in celebratione sacramenti eucharistiæ effundi solitas.... Harum enim clausulam jam primo ecclesiæ ævo fuisse, *per omnia sæcula sæculorum*, probare contendit ex Liturgiis Jacobi, Clementis, &c. Atqui has quidem vel suppositas, vel interpolatas esse satis constat. Attamen haud vane augurari licet, illos, qui in omnibus istis Liturgiis exprimuntur, quique jam olim ubique inter sacra mysteria usitati fuere, ritus ex apostolica traditione fluxisse. Id saltem ex hoc Valentinianorum argumento liquet, secunda post Christum natum ætate dictam formulam in usu fuisse.

[73] L. 8. c. 12. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 404.) *Ὅτι σοι πᾶσα δόξα, σέβας, καὶ εὐχαριστία· τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀνελλειπεῖς καὶ ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς λεγέτω, Ἀμήν.*

[74] Stromat. 7. c. 6. (p. 848. 19.) *Τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀνακειμένων, μίαν ὥσπερ ἔχον φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν, καὶ μίαν γνώμην.*

the penitents by the Valentinians' imposition of hands[75], in the close of which were these words, 'that they may obtain angelical absolution.' Not to mention that common form of doxology, which he uses at the end of his Pædagogue[76], 'To whom be glory both now and for ever, world without end. Amen.'

Next after him Tertullian often tells us, that they used the Lord's Prayer as a form enjoined by divine command, of which I shall say more in a following chapter[77]. He also says[78], 'that the form of baptism was appointed and prescribed by Christ to be always in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' And not only so, but to this the Church added several other ceremonies and observations, which were not enjoined expressly in so many words by Christ; as the form[79] of renouncing the Devil and his pomp and his angels; the trine immersion; the interrogatories and responses, which were made in a certain form, to the articles of the Creed; the giving of milk and honey to the newly baptized; the obligation to abstain from bathing for a whole week after: all which observations were only of ecclesiastical institution and prescription. So again[80], their receiving the eucharist in their

[75] Epitome. (p. 974. 17.) Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ λέγουσιν ἐπὶ τέλους, Εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικήν.

[76] L. 3. c. 12. (p. 311. 19.) Ὦ ἡ δόξα, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

[77] Ch. 7. of this Book.

[78] De Bapt. c. 13. (p. 229 c.) Lex enim tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta: Ite, &c.

[79] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 101 c.) Et quamdiu per hanc lineam serram reciprocabimus, habentes observationem inveteratam, quæ præveniendo statum fecit? Hanc si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certe consuetudo corroboravit, quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit. Quomodo enim usurpari quid potest, si traditum prius non est? Etiam in traditionis obtentu exigenda est, inquis, auctoritas scripta. Ergo quæramus, an et traditio nisi scripta non debeat recipi? Plane negabimus recipiendam, si nulla exempla præjudicent aliarum observationum, quas sine ullius Scripturæ instrumento, solius traditionis titulo, et exinde consuetudinis patrocinio vindicamus. Denique, ut a baptismate ingrediar, aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia, sub antistitis manu contestamur nos renuntiare Diabolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Inde suscepti, lactis et mellis concordiam prægustamus: exque ea die lavacro quotidiano per totam hebdomadem abstinemus.

[80] Ibid. (p. ead.) Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus. Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus. Calicis aut

morning assemblies before day, which Christ instituted after supper; their annual oblations and commemorations for the dead; their avoiding fasting and refusing to pray kneeling on the Lord's-day, and on the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost; their signing themselves with the sign of the cross upon all occasions; and[81] their appointing of occasional fasts, together with the fast of Lent and the stationary days. None of which were of express divine command, but were instituted by the Church, with many other observations of the like nature, for the edification of her children, as her rules of discipline, and psalmody, and singing a particular psalm at the eucharist, which is mentioned by our author[82]. Again[83] he intimates, that in all their assemblies they had not only sermons and prayers, but also the Scriptures read, and psalms sung to the glory of God; which must be allowed to be forms of praise and glorification. Nor would it be material to suggest, that Tertullian, when he wrote this, was a Montanist; for both the Church and heretics commonly agreed in singing of David's psalms, and even vied in hymns of their own composition and prescription. Tertullian indeed does not expressly say, that their prayers, like their psalms, were offered in a certain form

panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur. Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quacumque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. Harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies: traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix.

[81] De Jejun. c. 13. (p. 551 b.) Præscribitis constituta esse solemnia huic fidei Scripturis vel traditione majorum, nihilque observationis amplius adjiciendum, ob illicitum innovationis. State in isto gradu, si potestis. Ecce enim convenio vos et præter Pascha jejunantes, citra illos dies, quibus ablatus est sponsus, et stationum semijejunia interponentes, et vero interdum pane et aqua victitantes, ut cuique visum est. Denique respondetis, hæc ex arbitrio agenda, non ex imperio. Movistis igitur gradum, excedendo traditionem, cum, quæ non sint constituta, obitis. Quale est autem, ut tuo arbitrio permittas, quod imperio Dei non das? plus humanæ licebit voluntati, quam divinæ potestati? ... Bene autem, quod et episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent; non dico de industria stipium conferendarum, ut vestræ capturæ est; sed interdum et ex aliqua solicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa, &c.

[82] Ibid. (p. 552 a.) Vide quam bonum, et quam jucundum habitare fratres in unum. Hoc tu psallere non facile nosti, nisi quo tempore cum compluribus cœnas.

[83] De Anima, c. 9. (p. 270 a.) Jam vero prout Scripturæ leguntur, aut Psalmi canuntur, aut allocutiones proferuntur, aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiæ visionibus subministrantur.

of words; but he says what may incline a man reasonably to believe it. For as a proof of the Christians' loyalty, he says[84], 'they met together, and as if they were drawn up in battle, did jointly set upon God with their prayers, which violence was acceptable to him. They prayed for the emperors, for their officers and powers, for the state of the world, for the peace of their government, and for the continuance of their empire.' And again he says, 'they prayed constantly for all the emperors, that they might have a long life and quiet reign; that their family might be safe, their armies valiant, their senate faithful, their people virtuous, and that the whole world might be in peace.' Now these, as we shall see hereafter, were known parts of the Church's liturgy; and if they had not been of constant use, they had been but poor arguments of the Christians' loyalty, for which Tertullian here produces them.

In another place he expressly mentions the same doxology, as Irenæus does before him; for, speaking against Christians frequenting the Roman theatres[85], he asks them 'with what face they could go from the church of God into the church of the Devil? And with that mouth, wherewith they had said Amen! at the consecration or reception of the eucharist, give testimony to a gladiator? Or say, World without end! to any besides God and Christ, or to any besides Christ their God?' I do not take this, with some learned men, to mean that common form of doxology, Glory be to the Father, &c.! at the end of the Psalms, but the conclusion of the consecration-prayer in the communion-service, which, as I noted before, always ended with those words, *εἰς αἰῶνας· world without end!* to which the people subjoined their Amen. And then it is an evident proof that the African Churches had a certain form of prayer for consecrating the eucharist, the known words of

[84] Apol. c. 39. (p. 31 a.) Coimus [al. in cœtum et congregationem, ut] ad Deum, quasi manu facta, precationibus ambiamus [al. orantes.] Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.—Ibid. c. 25. (p. 27 b.) Oramus [al. precantes sumus semper] pro omnibus imperatoribus, &c.

[85] De Spectac. c. 25. (p. 83 b.) Quale est enim de ecclesia Dei in Diaboli ecclesiam tendere? .... Ex ore illo, quo Amen! in sanctum protuleris, gladiatori testimonium reddere? *Εἰς αἰῶνας ἀπ' αἰῶνος* alii omnino dicere nisi Deo Christo? or, as other copies have it, nisi Deo et Christo.

which Tertullian could allege to the people as an argument to dissuade them from frequenting the Heathen theatres. He also intimates[86] that they sang psalms and hymns alternately in private; for, to dissuade Christian women from marrying Heathen husbands, he uses this argument, 'What will such an husband sing to his wife, or the wife to her husband?' But if they married Christian husbands, 'then they would sing psalms and hymns between themselves, and mutually provoke one another[87], and strive who should make the sweetest melody to their God.' And there is no doubt to be made but that this private psalmody was an imitation of the public psalmody of the Church. So when he says[88], 'that at their feasts of charity, after the communion was ended, in the close of all, when they had washed their hands and brought in lights, every one was excited either to sing something out of Scripture, or some hymn of his own composing:' this as plainly argues that they made use of forms in this part of their private devotions. For the Psalms of Scripture are undoubtedly forms: and hymns of private composition are no less so, unless we will suppose every one that sings has words suggested to him by immediate inspiration; which still will be a form to the congregation that hears it, though not to the person who is so extraordinarily inspired by the Holy Ghost.

But there is one expression in Tertullian which the opposers of liturgies lay great stress upon, because he says[89], 'the Christians prayed for the emperor, *sine monitore, quia de pectore, without any monitor, because they prayed from their heart.*' Which they expound, *praying extempore.* But if this be interpreted rigidly, it will prove much more than the objectors design. For if they prayed simply without any monitor, then it will exclude even the minister's dictating to them his own conceptions; because these will be an admonition or direction

[86] Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 6. (p. 170 a.) Quid maritus suus illi, vel marito quid illa cantabit?

[87] Ibid. 9. (p. 172 b.) Sonant inter duos psalmi et hymni, et mutuo provocant, quis melius Deo suo cantet?

[88] Apol. c. 39. (p. 32 b.) Post aquam manualem et lumina, ut quisque de Scripturis sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere.

[89] Apol. c. 30. (p. 27 b.) Illuc [al. sursum] suspicientes Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis; capite nudo, quia non erubescimus; denique sine monitore, quia de pectore, oramus pro omnibus imperatoribus &c.

to the people: and so all public prayer must cease, and all devotion be resolved into the private prayers of the people. Which is such an absurdity, as neither Tertullian ever thought of, nor the objectors themselves will allow. Whatever therefore be meant by this phrase, 'praying from the heart without a monitor,' it cannot mean that the people's prayers were simply their own conceptions. Among the many interpretations which are put upon these words by learned men, which may be seen in Dr. Faulkner[90] or Dr. Comber[91], I take these two to be the most natural; either, first, that they prayed *memoriter*, saying their prayers by heart, and needing no prompter, as the Heathens did; which is the sense that Rigaltius[92] and Bishop Fell[93] put upon it; in which sense it is an argument for liturgies, and not against them; or, secondly, that they prayed sincerely from the heart, and freely out of the loyalty of their own heart without compulsion, as Hamon Lestrange[94] and Dr. Comber[95] interpret it. Which seems to be the truest sense: for the Heathens were neither sincere, nor hearty, nor zealous in their prayers for the emperor; but the Christians offered their prayers with all those due qualifications as became the character of truly pious votaries and loyal subjects. The sense of this dark passage being thus cleared, it remains no argument against liturgies, unless a man will say there can be no such thing as sincerity and heartiness in a form of prayer. Which would be to condemn the whole Catholic Church in the time of Tertullian, from whose testimonies it is evident that forms were generally used in most parts of divine service.

I have nothing further to add in this century, but only one or two small observations out of the Acts of St. Perpetua and

[90] Libertas Ecclesiastica, &c. b. 1. ch. 4. s. 2. (p. 112.) Objections against set forms answered.

[91] Origin of Liturgies, part 1. ch. 2. (p. 47.) But his main objection &c. [See ibid. part 2. ch. 1. s. 10. (pp. 47, seqq.) But my adversary &c. Ed.]

[92] In Tertul. loc. supr. cit. (p. 27. n. 13.) Apud ethnicos monitor præibat preces, ac de scripto quidem, ne quid verborum præteriretur, aut præposterum, diceretur; rursusque alius custos erat, qui attenderet; alius qui faveri linguis juberet.

[93] Not. in Cypr. de Orat. Dom. (p. 107. n. 2.) Nihil in Christiana pietate precum formulis antiquis. Sacerdos verbis conceptis præibat, plebs invicem respondebat, idque *sine monitore*, quod Gentilibus solemne, *quia*, ut ait Tertullianus, Apol. c. 30, *de pectore orabant*, id est, preces memoriter tenebant.

[94] Smectymnuomastix. (p. 5.)

[95] Origin of Liturgies. (p. 49.)

Felicitas, two African martyrs, who suffered in the latter end of this age. There it is remarked of Perpetua[96], 'that seeming in a vision to receive the eucharist into her hands and eat it, all that stood round her said, Amen!' alluding to the custom of saying Amen! at the reception of it from the hands of the minister in the church. There is a like allusion[97] to the use of the Trisagion, Holy! Holy! Holy! which the angels used in heaven. And a further intimation of the solemn custom of giving the peace and the kiss of peace in the communion. For it is said[98] 'that Perpetua and her brother Saturus saluted one another with a kiss before they suffered, that they might consummate their martyrdom by the solemn rites of giving the peace.'

What evidence there is for the use of set forms in the third century.

6. In the beginning of the third century, about the year 220, lived Hippolytus the martyr, and bishop of Adana or Portus Romanus in Arabia. Among other learned works, he wrote a book called Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις περὶ Χαρισμάτων, *The Apostolical Tradition concerning Ecclesiastical Offices.* Which, according to the general opinion of the most learned critics, Dr. Bernard, Dr. Gale, and others[99], is no other than the Eighth Book of those called the Apostolical Constitutions, which they think were compiled and published at Rome by this author. And if so, there can be no question what his opinion was about the use of forms in divine service: for that book is nothing else but a collection of such forms as either were in use, or made in imitation of those that were then in use in the Church. I will not allege any of them here, because I do it in every part of this work, and it would be very needless and superfluous here to repeat them.

Besides this, Hippolytus wrote a Book of Odes or Hymns upon several parts of Scripture, some of which most probably were of use in the public service. For in another treatise of

[96] Ad calc. Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum, (Oxon. 1680. p. 10.) Et ego accepi junctis manibus, et manducavi: et universi circumstantes dixerunt, Amen!

[97] Ibid. (p. 23.) Introivimus et audivimus vocem unitam, dicentem Hagios! Hagios! Hagios! sine cessatione.

[98] Ibid. (p. 35.) Ante jam osculati invicem, ut martyrium per solennia pacis consummarent.

[99] Hist. Liter. (v. 2. p. 46.) Περὶ χαρισμάτων. Opus aliunde incognitum. Suspicor partem fuisse Ἀποστολικῶν Διατάξεων; quas Hippolytus ex Oriente Romam attulit, quæ etiam nunc exstant.

the Consummation of the World and Antichrist[1] he commends the use of doxologies, and psalms, and spiritual odes; and makes it one of the signs of the reign of Antichrist, 'that liturgy shall be extinguished, psalmody shall cease, and reading of the Scriptures shall not be heard.' It is true indeed some learned men, Bishop Usher[2], Combefis[3], and Du Pin[4], reject this as a spurious tract, composed by some modern Greeks: but as learned critics, Labbe[5] and Bp. Bull[6], have undertaken

[1] Ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. s. Auctar. Ducæan. (t. 2. p. 387 b. 2.) *Λειτουργία σβεσθήσεται· ψαλμῳδία παυσθήσεται· ἀνάγνωσις τῶν Γραφῶν οὐκ εἰσακουσθήσεται.*——Ibid. (p. 362 a. 10.) *Τὸ στόμα ὑμῶν πρὸς δοξολογίαν, καὶ αἶνον, καὶ ψαλμοὺς, καὶ ᾠδὰς πνευματικὰς ηὐτρέπισα λαλεῖν, καὶ μελετᾶν διὰ παντὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, κ. τ. λ.*

[2] Biblioth. Theolog. ap. Cav. Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 70.) Genuinum Hippolyti opus non esse, pluribus probare nititur Rev. Usserius in Biblioth. Theol. MS., argumenta sua his demum verbis claudens: 'Apparet igitur tum ex ipso Græcæ dictionis genere, ... tum ex rei veritate, atque pondere, libelli istius auctorem hominem illiteratum fuisse atque indoctum.'

[3] Auctar. Noviss. (part. 1. p. 50.) where this Tract of Hippolytus is omitted.

[4] Biblioth. v. 1. p. 104. (t. 1. p. 112.) Il est fort incertain, si c'est le traité de l'Antichrist, qui est attribué présentement à Hippolite, &c.

[5] De Scriptor Eccles. (t. 1. p. 471.) Scio hæreticorum proceres, Jo. Juellum, ... Robertum Cocum, Isaacum Casaubonum, similesque heterodoxos, orationem illam [de Consummatione Mundi] conatos arguere falsi. 1. Quia incipit *Ἐπειδὴ γάρ.* Novum crimen, superi! atque inauditum! 2. Quod somnia narret. Quæ? At esto, id ita sit: an quoties aberrat aliquis et varia sectatur, ejus continuo repudianda et abdicanda ratio? 3. Quia existimat, Johannem evangelistam minime mortuum. At idem dixerunt alii, quorum tamen opera indubitata sunt et inconcussa. Certe de antichristo et resurrectione scripsisse, testis est mox laudatus Hieronymus, c. 61. Catalogi.

[6] Defens. Fid. Nic. s. 3. c. 8. p. 369. (p. 220.) Sunt tamen viri quidam docti inter Neotericos, qui hoc Hippolyti opus abjudicant satis fidenter; sed rationibus inducti, meo quidem judicio, levissimis; immo quæ, si accuratius expendantur, contra ipsos militent. Primo ipsis displicet Græcæ dictionis genus, quodque liber incipiat ab *Ἐπειδὴ γάρ.* Quam objectionem merito ita irrisit Philippus Labbeus: *Novum crimen, superi, atque inauditum!* Sane præterquam quod eruditi in hoc literarum genere probe norunt, ab omnibus Græcis scriptoribus ecclesiasticis perpolitum Græcæ dictionis genus frustra requiri, Photius, qui indubitata Hippolyti scripta legerat, de ejus phrasi expresse monuit (cod. 121.) quod *πρὸς τὸν Ἀττικὸν οὐκ ἐπιστρέφεται λόγον, ad sermonem Atticum non tendat.* Et alibi, (nempe cod. 202.) rursus de Hippolyti dicendi genere locutus, ait: *Τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ὅντι μάλα θεσμοὺς δυσωπεῖται· Atticas revera leges valde repudiat.* Præterea id offendit hos censores, quod in eo opere multæ reperiantur de natalibus et vita Antichristi inanes conjecturæ; v. g. Antichristum non hominem, sed dæmonem fore humana figura præditum. Sed quis nescit, illorum temporum scriptores multa perabsurda de Antichristo, ut de re obscura, tradidisse? Ac de Hippolyto diserte testatur Photius codice proxime citato, quod in interpretatione Danielis, ubi de Antichristo etiam agit, *πολλὰ ἀρχαιοτρόπως, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸ ὕστερον διηκριβωμένον, καταλέγει, multa veteri more, non, ut postea fuere accuratius excussa, recenseat.* Quin et de hoc

to defend it, and answer all the arguments that are produced against it, I will not enter into this debate, but only say, that as there is nothing in this passage now alleged dissonant to the sense of Hippolytus's other works, we may be allowed to cite it in this cause, till some clearer evidence can be produced against it. Hippolytus wrote also a book, called, *Canon Paschalis*, which Scaliger[7] and Gothofred[8] take to be *a Calendar*,

ipso Hippolyti opere, quod de Antichristo inscribitur, ibidem, ut audivimus, monet, in ipso esse *τὸ τῶν νοημάτων ἁπλούστερόν τε καὶ ἀρχαιότροπον, sensuum simplicitatem majorem* (ubi *τὸ ἁπλοῦν*, quod a Græcis fieri solet, *τῷ ἀκριβεῖ* opponitur) *et vetustatem.* Antichristum vero malo spiritu conceptum fore, receptior fuit doctorum in veteri ecclesia opinio. Hinc id ipsum pro indubio et rato tradidit ille vere *θαυμάσιος* Martinus, apud Severum Sulpicium, Dialog. 2. c. 16. Et auctor Tractatus de Antichristo apud Augustinum de Antichristi Conceptione sic scribit: *Diabolus simul in matris ejus uterum introibit, et totam eam replebit, totam circumdabit, totam tenebit, et totam interius exteriusque possidebit.* Quid? quod ipse Irenæus, cujus auditor Hippolytus fuisse perhibetur, eandem sententiam tradidit. Nam de Antichristo hæc refert, (l. 5. c. 25.) *Ille enim omnem suscipiens Diaboli virtutem, veniet non quasi rex justus, nec quasi in subjectione Dei legitimus; sed impius, et injustus, et sine lege, quasi apostata, et iniquus et homicida, quasi latro, diabolicam apostasiam in se recapitulans.* Hæc itaque librum istum Hippolyti genuinum esse, non parum confirmant. Denique objiciunt, scriptorem illum affirmare, animas hominum a sæculis fuisse, quod fuit Origenis figmentum. Sed hinc etiam non leve argumentum arripio, quo probem, Hippolytum esse revera libri auctorem. Quippe Origenem aliquando Hippolyti auditorem fuisse, constat ex Hieronymo, qui ait ipsum ..... Hippolytum fuisse Clementis Alexandrini discipulum. Clemens autem ille decreto Platonis de animæ præexistentia favisse deprehenditur, Strom. l. 1., et clarius, l. 3, uti etiam ab Huetio observatum est. Ab hoc itaque Clemente et Hippolytus et Origenes, uterque ejus discipulus, quanquam Hippolytus in ea schola senior fuit, dogma illud hauserunt. Ut verbo igitur dicam, omnia in libro de Antichristo ita Hippolyto conveniunt, ut, etiamsi titulus non moneret, facile per se nasutiores possent odorari, ipsum ab Hippolyto revera profectum esse.

[7] De Emendat. Tempor. l. 7. (p. 726 a. 10.) Hæc omnia, quæ inclusa sunt in cellulis areæ Laterculi, sunt lectiones ex utroque Testamento, quarum usus erat eo tempore in ecclesia. Sed quædam earum statæ sunt ex orbe hebdomadum, et eidem diei hebdomadis hærent, aliquando fortassis eidem diei mensis: quædam vaga pro ratione termini. Ut, ecce! *Γένεσις Χριστοῦ* quotannis ex primo Matthæi *ἐν προδιανυκτερεύσει*, sive *παραμοναῖς* natalis Christi legebatur mense Pharmuthi, quo tempore quidem natum Dominum putabant, ut scribit Clemens Alexandrinus.

[8] In Cod. Theod. l. 15. t. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. (t. 5. p. 356 ad summ. col. dextr.) In genere notum jam aliunde, vel ex Ambrosio et Augustino, lectiones ex utroque Testamento solemnes in ecclesia olim fuisse, et quidem statas, ex orbe, ac nominatim ex Novo Testamento, quæ *ἀποστολο-ευάγγελα* postea dicta, et *εὐαγγελιστάρια*: cujus rei luculentum testimonium in Hippolyti episcopi *Paschali* occurrit, ubi lectiones hujusmodi designantur in cellulis areæ Laterculi; ut, ecce! *Γένεσις Χριστοῦ* quotannis ex primo Matthæi *ἐν προδιανυκτερεύσει*, sive *παραμοναῖς* natalis Christi legebatur

showing what lessons were to be read on several festivals; as the first of St. Matthew, called Γένεσις, *the Generation of Christ*, on the vigil of Christ's nativity; and the Πάθος, or *the History of his Sufferings*, out of the Gospel of St. Matthew, on the day of his crucifixion: and it is certain from many passages in St. Chrysostom, and St. Austin, and others, that such Calendars were used in the Church, as shall be shown in another place[8], when I come to speak of the ancient method of reading the Holy Scriptures by a certain rule and order in divine service. But because Ægidius Bucherius, who has since republished this Paschal Cycle[9], and Dr. Cave[10] give another interpretation of it, I will lay no greater stress upon it than it will bear, contenting myself in so critical a point to have suggested the sense of learned men, and leave the matter to the further disquisition of the curious reader; having otherwise given sufficient evidence that the Church in the time of Hippolytus used stated forms of prayer and praises in her public service.

Not long after Hippolytus lived Origen, who was one of his scholars, and took some of his opinions from him. Now this writer in his Homilies upon Jeremy[11] expressly mentions one of the prayers of constant use in the Church: 'We frequently say in our prayers,' says he, 'Grant us, O Almighty God, grant us a part with thy Prophets; grant us a part with the Apostles of thy Christ; grant that we may be found at the feet of thy Only-begotten Son.' Which is a testimony so clear, that the Centuriators[12] made no scruple to conclude hence,

undecima Pharmuthi, quo tempore quidam natum Dominum putabant, ut scribit Clemens Alexandrinus. Ita *πάθος Χριστοῦ* die passionis Dominicæ, id est, ex quorundam sententia, vicesima quinta Martii, aliaque, quæ in eo Canone videre est, et Scaliger explicavit.

[8] B. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. in the next vol.

[9] [De Doctrina Temporum, Commentarius in Victorii Canonem Paschalem. Antwerp. 1633. fol. Ed.]

[10] Hist. Liter. (v. 2. p. 46.) *Ἀπόδειξις χρόνων τοῦ Πάσχα*, &c.

[11] Hom. 11. in Jerem. p. 606. [juxt. Ed. Basil. 1571.] Frequenter in oratione dicimus, Da Omnipotens, da nobis partem cum prophetis; da cum apostolis Christi tui; tribue ut inveniamur ad vestigia Unigeniti tui. [juxt. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1733. (t. 3. p. 217 d.) *Πολλάκις ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς λέγομεν, Θεὲ Παντοκράτωρ, τὴν μερίδα ἡμῶν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν δὸς, τὴν μερίδα ἡμῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου δὸς, ἵνα εὑρεθῶμεν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[12] Cent. 3. c. 6. p. 94. (p. 135, 23.) Formulas denique quasdam, precationum absque dubio habuerunt. Origenes enim Homilia undecima in Hieremiam ad eas, quas *collectas* hodie vocant, alludere vi-

that forms of prayer were undoubtedly used in the Church in the time of Origen. He elsewhere[13] says, 'the Christians used the ordered or prescribed prayers, as became them, continually night and day, whereby they were preserved against the power of magic and the Devil.' For Celsus[14] in his spiteful way had advanced an egregious calumny against the Christians, pretending 'that he had seen in the hands of some of their presbyters certain barbarous books, containing the names of the devils and their impostors;' hereby insinuating, that the prayers which the Christian presbyters had in their books were only magical enchantments: which calumny Origen not only rejects with scorn, appealing to the experience of the world, which knew it to be a fiction, but also tells his adversary further, 'that the prayers, which they used by order and appointment, were such as rendered them invincible and proof against all the force of magic and power of the devils.' Now, considering that the objection of Celsus lay against the service-books of the Christian presbyters, it is reasonable to conclude, that Origen's answer relates to the same: for Origen does not deny that they had any such books, but only says their prayers which they were ordered to use were of a different nature from what the adversary had represented them.

To this we may add what Origen says in his Comments upon Job[15], 'that by ancient custom of the Church the Book of Job was always read in Lent, and particularly in the Passion-week, as most properly adapted to that occasion.' The reader may find this passage at length hereafter[16], and therefore it is sufficient to hint in this place, that the Scriptures in his time were methodized and brought under rule, being read by some certain order and prescription.

detur; ubi, inquit, *Frequenter in oratione dicimus, Da, Omnipotens, &c.*—See n. 11, preceding.

[13] Cont. Cels. l. 6. p. 302. (t. 1. p. 663 a.) *Διαβεβαιούμεθα δὲ ἡμεῖς, καὶ τῇ πείρᾳ παραλαβόντες, ὅτι οἱ κατὰ Χριστιανισμὸν διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεραπεύοντες Θεὸν, καὶ βιοῦντες κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ, ταῖς προσταχθείσαις τε εὐχαῖς συνεχέστερον καὶ δεόντως νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας χρώμενοι, οὔτε μαγείᾳ, οὔτε δαιμονίοις εἰσὶν ἅλωτοί.*

[14] [Ibid. (p. 662 b, c.) ... *Ἔφησεν ἑωρακέναι παρά τισι πρεσβυτέροις, τῆς ἡμετέρας δόξης τυγχανοῦσι, βιβλία βάρβαρα, δαιμόνων ὀνόματα ἔχοντα καὶ τερατείας· κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[15] In Job. l. 1. p. 366. (t. 2. p. 851 b.) In conventu ecclesiæ, in diebus sanctis legitur passio Job, in diebus jejunii, in diebus abstinentiæ, in diebus, in quibus tanquam compatiuntur ii, qui jejunant et abstinent, admirabili illi Job, &c.

[16] B. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. in next vol.

Not long after Origen, St. Cyprian testifies not only that the Lord's Prayer was used as a form, and as a spiritual form, most acceptable to God, as we shall see hereafter; but also mentions several other forms of common and noted use in divine service. As in the administration of baptism every one was to renounce the Devil and the world in a certain form of words then vulgarly known in the Church, which Cyprian[17] more than once has occasion to mention. They were likewise to make profession of the several articles of the Christian faith in a certain form of words, which every Church had for that purpose, and for this particular use collected into a Creed. Cyprian[18] often specifies both the interrogatories, and the answers that were made upon this occasion: and he assures us[19], they were so precise to a form, that the Novatians themselves used the very same words in their questions and responses, as the Catholics did: they observed the same rule as the Church did; they baptized with the same Creed; they asked the party, 'Whether he believed in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Whether he believed in the remission of sins, and eternal life by the holy Church?' Which were the first and last words in the Creed. So they kept close to the same form of words, though they differed about the sense of them in some particulars relating to remission of sins, and the Church. Which is so clear an argument for the observation of a form in baptism, that I see not what can reasonably be replied to it.

Then again, for the prayers in the administration of the

[17] De Lapsis, p. 125. (p. 89.) Stare illic potuit Dei servus, et loqui et renuntiare Christo, qui jam Diabolo renuntiaret et sæculo? — Ep. 7. [al. 13.] ad Rogat. p. 37. (p. 190.) Sæculo renuntiaverimus, cum baptizati sumus.

[18] Ep. 70. ad Episc. Numid. p. 190. (p. 301.) Sed et ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam? Intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in ecclesia dari, &c.

[19] Ep. 69. [al. 76.] Ad Magnum, p. 183. (p. 296.) .... Eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica ecclesia teneat; eodem symbolo, quo et nos baptizare; eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum: ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discrepare; sciat, quisquis hoc opponendum putat; primum, non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem; neque eandem interrogationem. Nam quum dicunt, Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam? Mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.

eucharist, nothing can be more evident, than that the people bare a part in them. I will not insist on those expressions of his[20], 'that they had public and common prayer,' because they are capable of an evasion: but what he says of 'the people's answering to the priest' is not to be evaded. For persuading the people to use diligence and attention in their prayers, he puts them in mind of an usual form of speech, which the whole Church used in order to raise their souls to a spiritual and heavenly temper. 'The priest,' says he[21], 'before prayer prepares the hearts of the brethren, by premising a preface, and saying, Lift up your hearts! that whilst the people answer, We lift them up unto the Lord! they may be admonished at that time to think of nothing but the Lord only.' What Cyprian says here of this preface coming before the prayer, is not so to be understood as if it came before all the prayers of the Church, but immediately before the prayer of consecration in the communion service: for, as we shall see hereafter, there came before this both the prayers for the catechumens and penitents, and the prayers for the faithful, or the whole state of Christ's Church; but when the solemn prayer of the oblation was to be made, then it was that the priest called upon the people in this form, Lift up your hearts! and they answered, We lift them unto the Lord! The priest went on again, and said, Let us give thanks to our Lord God! and the people answered, It is just and right so to do! Then followed the eucharistical or consecration prayer, and the Lord's Prayer; and after that the salutation, *Pax vobis! Peace be with you!* to which the people answered, And with thy spirit! After which they gave one another mutually the kiss of peace, and then proceeded to receive the holy sacrament. This was the form and order of the communion service in St. Austin's time in the African Church; and it is very probable it might be much the same in the time of Cyprian: but Cyprian had no occasion to mention any other part of the prayers, but only that which

[20] De Orat. Dom. p. 141. (p. 100.) Publica est nobis et communis oratio. — Ep. 8. [al. 11.] ad Cler. p. 26. (p. 187.) . . . . Oratione communi et concordi prece pro omnibus jussit orare.

[21] Ibid. p. 152. (p. 107.) Ideo et sacerdos ante orationem, præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes, dicendo, Sursum corda! ut dum respondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum! admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere.

related to his particular subject; which one is sufficient to prove that stated forms of prayer were then allowed in the public service of the Church of Carthage, and probably in the rest of the African Churches.

At the same time with Cyprian lived Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who, having occasion to speak of a certain woman, an impostor, who pretended to the spirit of prophecy, says[22], 'she took upon her to consecrate the eucharist with the venerable invocation, and ceremony of predication then commonly used in the Church:' he means the commemoration of God's great blessings bestowed upon man, and the repetition of the history of the first institution of the Lord's supper, which by the Ancients is called Ἀνάμνησις, and *Solita Prædicatio*, a thing seldom or never omitted in the consecration of the eucharist. He adds also, 'that the same impostor baptized many, using the common and appointed interrogatories, that she might not seem to vary in any thing from the rule of the Church.' She made them answer to every article of the Creed,—'the Creed,' as he calls it, 'of the Holy Trinity;' she put the usual questions to them prescribed by the Church, that is, 'Whether they renounced the Devil, his angels, his pomp, and his service?' And, 'Whether they made a covenant with Christ?' And she did every thing *ad imaginem veritatis, according to the exact method and form*, that was observed in the Church. Now, though all this was done by the Devil, speaking in an impostor; yet being done according to the exact rules of the Church, it argues that the Church at that time had a stated rule and order for administering both the sacraments, and that the forms were so well known, that this woman could imitate them so exactly, as in nothing to

[22] Ep. 75. ad Cypr. p. 223. (323.) Atqui illa mulier, quæ prius per præstigias et fallacias dæmonis multa ad deceptionem fidelium moliebatur, inter cætera, quibus plurimos deceperat etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem, et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitæ prædicationis offerret; baptizaret quoque multos, usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nil discrepare ab ecclesiastica regula videretur..... Numquid et hoc Stephanus, et qui illi consentiunt, comprobant? Maxime cui nec symbolum Trinitatis nec interrogatio legitima et ecclesiastica defuit? Potest credi aut remissio peccatorum data, aut lavacri salutaris regeneratio rite perfecta, ubi omnia quamvis ad imaginem veritatis, tamen per dæmonem gesta sunt, &c.

vary from the usual solemnities either of prayers, or other ceremonies then observed in the Church. And if we consider, that the administration of the two sacraments was then the most considerable part of the Church's service, this is as clear an evidence as we can desire, to prove that prescribed forms were now in use in the Asiatic Churches.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocæsarea in Pontus, was contemporary with Firmilian, and he was a man famous for working miracles by the Spirit, whence he had the name of *Thaumaturgus, the Wonder-Worker.* There is no doubt but that he prayed also by the Spirit, yet he prayed by a form; which shows, that praying by a form, and praying by the Spirit, are not inconsistent. As he was the founder of his Church, finding but seventeen Christians when he came thither, and leaving but seventeen Heathens when he was taken from it, so he left them a liturgy or form of divine service, which they were so tenacious of, that as St. Basil [23] testifies of them, 'they would not suffer one ceremony, or one word, or one mystical form to be added to those which he had left among them.' He settled the way of singing psalms, not alternately, but by the common voice of the people all joining together: and the clergy of Neocæsarea were such admirers of this rule, that, when St. Basil had introduced the alternate way in his own Church, they were offended at it, and objected against him, that it was not so in the days of Gregory the Great. Upon which St. Basil was forced to write an apologetical Epistle to them in vindication of his practice [24], wherein he shows, that the way of alternate song was now conformable to the practice of all the Eastern Churches, except that of Neocæsarea; and that however tenacious that Church had formerly been of the ways and forms of Gregory, yet in one particular they had now made an alteration; for in the days of Gregory they had none of that peculiar form of prayers called *litanies*, which now in St. Basil's time they had admitted into their service, and were very zealous in the use of it, notwithstanding

[23] De Spirit. Sanct. c. 29. p. 360. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 87 e. n. 74.) ..... Οὐ πράξιν τινὰ, οὐ λόγον, οὐ τύπον τινὰ μυστικὸν, παρ' ὃν ἐκείνοις κατέλιπε, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσέθηκαν.

[24] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] (t. 3. part. 2. p. 451 d. n. 4.) .... Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αἱ λιτανεῖαι [ἐπὶ Γρηγορίου], ἃς ὑμεῖς νῦν ἐπιτηδεύετε, κ. τ. λ.

that it was neither of St. Gregory's composition, nor used at all in his days. As this shows that the use of litanies was brought into the Church of Neocæsarea some years after the time of St. Gregory; so it as evidently proves, that their other forms were instituted by him, and derived their original from his composition, who was the first founder of the Church.

Not long after this, we find a complaint made by the Council of Antioch[25], anno 270, against Paulus Samosatensis, the heretical bishop of that place, that he had forbidden the use of such psalms, or hymns, as were used to be sung in the church to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, under pretence that they were only the novel compositions of late and modern authors. I have already produced this passage more at length[26] to prove the worship of our Saviour: and here it serves to prove, that they worshipped him by certain forms of praise, which the bishop cast out of the Church, upon a pretence of novelty: which was but a mere pretence; for such forms of praise had been in use in the Church ἀπαρχῆς, *from the beginning*, as the ancient writer against the heresy of Artemon in Eusebius[27] words it. And about the same time Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, composed hymns of the like nature for the service of the Church, for which he is commended by Dionysius[28], bishop of Alexandria, who also himself used a certain form of doxology to the whole Trinity, as is reported by St. Basil[29], who also tells us in the same place, that Athenogenes, the martyr, composed hymns to the glory of the Holy Ghost; and adds, 'that the hymn called *hymnus lucernalis, the hymn to be sung at*

[25] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 362. 1.) Ψαλμοὺς δὲ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν παύσας, ὡς δὲ νεωτέρους καὶ νεωτέρων ἀνδρῶν συγγράμματα.

[26] See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 299. n. 29.

[27] L. 5. c. 28. See ibid. n. 28.

[28] Ep. ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 24. See ibid. p. 300. n. 30.

[29] De Spirit. Sanct. c. 29. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 84 e. n. 72.) ... Ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς Διονύσιος .... ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς τὸν ὁμώνυμον ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιστολῇ· .... Τούτοις, φησὶ, πᾶσιν ἀκολούθως καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ δὴ παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβυτέρων τύπον καὶ κανόνα παρειληφότες, ὁμοφώνως αὐτοῖς προσευχαριστοῦντες· καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν, ὑμῖν ἐπιστέλλοντες, καταπαύσομεν [al. καταπαύομεν] τῷ δὲ Θεῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ Υἱῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν.—Ibid. (p. 86 b. n. 73.) Ἔδοξε τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, μὴ σιωπῇ τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ φωτὸς δέχεσθαι, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς φανέντος εὐχαριστεῖν· καὶ ὅστις μὲν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίου εὐχαριστίας, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν. .... Εἰ δέ τις καὶ τὸν ὕμνον Ἀθηνογένους ἔγνω, κ. τ. λ.

lighting of candles in the evening service, containing a glorification of the Holy Trinity, was of ancient use in the Church, so ancient that he knew not who was the author of it.' But I have already alleged these more at large[29] in vindicating the worship of our Saviour, and therefore content myself barely to hint them as accustomed forms of praise in this place.

I shall only note one thing more in this century, out of the Epistle of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, recorded by Eusebius: which is, that it was customary in those days for a minister to use a form of words at the delivery of the bread and wine in the eucharist, saying, The body of Christ! or The blood of Christ! to which the people always answered, Amen! For Cornelius[30], speaking of the wickedness of Novatian, says, 'When he delivered the eucharist to the people, he obliged them instead of saying Amen! at the naming of it, to swear by the body and blood of Christ, that they would not desert his party, nor return to Cornelius.' Which custom of saying Amen! in answer to the minister, when he named the body or blood of Christ, is both an ancient and universal practice. For Tertullian[31], as has been shown already, mentions it long before; and we find it frequently in the writers of the next age, St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. Austin, St. Jerom, and the Author of the Constitutions; of which I shall have occasion to speak more in another place.

Evidence of of the use of set forms in the fourth century.

7. In the beginning of the fourth century, Arnobius[32], apologizing for the Christian devotions, tells the Heathens, they might know that they worshipped the supreme God, and called

[29] See ch. 2. s. 2. p. 296. n. 21.

[30] Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. p. 245. (v. 1. p. 315. 3.) Ποιήσας γὰρ τὰς προσφορὰς, καὶ διανέμων ἑκάστῳ τὸ μέρος, καὶ ἐπιδιδοὺς τοῦτο ὀμνύειν ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ἀνθρώπους ἀναγκάζει, κατέχων ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶ τὰς τοῦ λαβόντος, καὶ μὴ ἀφεὶς ἔστ' ἂν ὀμνύοντες εἴπωσι ταῦτα· τοῖς γὰρ ἐκείνου χρήσομαι λόγοις· Ὄμοσόν μοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μηδέ ποτέ με καταλιπεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς Κορνήλιον· καὶ ὁ ἄθλιος ἄνθρωπος οὐ πρότερον γεύεται, εἰ μὴ πρότερον αὐτῷ καταράσαιτο· καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν λαμβάνοντα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκεῖνον τὸ Ἀμὴν, Οὐκέτι ἀνήξω πρὸς Κορνήλιον λέγει.

[31] De Spectaculis, c. 25. (p. 83 c.) .... Ex ore quo Amen! in sanctum protuleris, &c. — See s. 5. p. 387. n. 85, preceding.

[32] Cont. Gent. l. 1. p. 24. (p. 14.) .... Summum tamen invocare nos Deum, et ab eo quod postulamus orare, vel auribus potuit scire, vel ipsius vocis sono, qua utimur in precibus, noscitare.

upon him for what they desired, by the sound of their voice, which they used in prayer. He says[33], they all prostrated themselves before him, adoring him with joint supplications. And he gives us the general heads of their prayers[34], which are very agreeable to the ancient forms of the Church, viz. 'That God would grant peace and pardon to all men, to the magistrates, to the armies, and to the emperors; to their friends and to their enemies; to those that were alive, and those that were set at liberty from the bonds of the body.' Which petitions are so conformable to the method and order of the ancient liturgies, that one might have imagined them to be offered by a form, though Arnobius had said nothing of their joint prayers, or vocal consent in their devotions.

Lactantius and Eusebius wrote after the great persecution, under Diocletian and his associates, was over: and they both take notice of forms of prayer appointed by the first Christian emperors for their soldiers to use, in imitation of those of the Church.

Lactantius says expressly, that when Licinius was about to join battle with Maximinus, Maximinus made a vow to Jupiter, that, if he got the victory, he would utterly extinguish and blot out the very name of Christians. Upon which, the night after, an angel of God came and stood by Licinius, as he lay at rest, bidding him rise quickly, and pray to the most high God with all his army, promising him the victory, if he did so. As soon as he heard this, he thought with himself, that he arose and stood with the angel, who gave him this warning, and who then taught him after what manner and in what words they should pray. Therefore[35] awaking out of sleep, he ordered a

[33] Ibid. p. 25. (p. ead. lin. ult.) Huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus.

[34] L. 4. p. 181. (p. 152.) Cur nostra meruerint immaniter conventicula dirui? In quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur, magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus, et resolutis corporum vinctione.

[35] De Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 46. (t. 2. p. 242.) Discusso somno notarium jussit asciri, et, sicut audierat, hæc verba dictavit. Summe Deus, te rogamus. Sancte Deus, te rogamus. Omnem justitiam tibi commendamus, salutem nostram tibi commendamus, imperium nostrum tibi commendamus. Per te vivimus, per te victores et felices existimus. Summe sancte Deus, preces nostras exaudi. Brachia nostra ad te tendimus. Exaudi sancte, summe Deus. Scribuntur hæc in libellis pluribus, et per præpositos tribunosque mittuntur, ut suos quisque milites doceat.... Erat jam utraque acies in conspectu. Liciniani scuta deponunt, galeas re-

notary to be brought to him, to whom he dictated the prayer in these very words, as he had heard them: 'O thou most High God, we beseech thee. O Holy God, we beseech thee. We commend all the justice of our cause to thee: we commend our safety unto thee: we commend our empire unto thee. By thee we live, by thee we are victorious and happy. O most High and Holy God, hear our prayers. We stretch forth our arms unto thee. Hear us, O most High and Holy God.' These words were written in many books, and sent by the generals and tribunes, that they might teach them to their soldiers. When the day of battle came, the soldiers laid aside their shields, and put off their helmets, and lifting up their hands to heaven, said the prayer after the emperor, their generals repeating it before them. And this they did so loudly, that the adverse army, about to be sacrificed, heard the echo of their prayer. Which when they had repeated three times, they were inspired with courage, and resuming their arms, though they were but a few, they without any loss gained a complete victory over their enemies; 'whom the most High God,' says our author, 'delivered up to be slaughtered, as if they had come not to engage in battle, but as men devoted to death and destined to destruction.'

It is not many years since this little golden tract of Lactantius came to light[35], and therefore probably this testimony may not very often have fallen under the observation of every ordinary reader. But as there is no dispute to be made of the truth of the relation upon the authority of Lactantius, so it is an illustrious evidence both of the opinion of Lactantius, and the general sense of Christians, that they did not think forms of prayer unlawful, because they were written in a book, nor the repetition of them any offence, for this prayer was thrice repeated. If it should be said, that this prayer was dictated im-

solvunt, ad cœlum manus tendunt, præeuntibus præpositis, et post imperatorem precem dicunt. Audit acies peritura precantium murmur. Illi oratione ter dicta, virtute jam pleni, &c.

[35] [It was first mentioned by St. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, sive *de Viris Illustribus*, under the name of *Firmianus*, c. 8. (Ed. Vallars. t. 2. p. 906.) Habemus ejus .... de Persecutione librum unum. The tract was originally published by Baluzius, in his Miscellanies. (Paris. 1678–1715.) It appeared again in Mansi's edition of that work. (Lucæ. 1761.) It was published separately at Oxford, 1680, 12mo, and again at the end of Spark's edition of Lactantius, 1684. Ed.]

mediately by an angel, the same and more may be said of the Lord's Prayer, that it was dictated by Christ himself, and the Psalms were written as forms of prayer and praise by an inspired penman; and yet there are those, who, for no other reason, but because they are forms, despise the use of them, when inserted into any liturgy of the Church.

Parallel to this testimony of Lactantius is that other relation of Eusebius[36] concerning Constantine, that he ordered all his soldiers, as many of them as were Heathens, 'to go forth into the field on the Lord's-day, and there with hands and hearts lift up to heaven, to offer up to God, *μεμελετημένην εὐχὴν, a certain prayer which they had learned and premeditated before.*' The prayer was to be said in the Latin tongue, which was the vulgar language, and in this express form of words[37]: 'We acknowledge thee to be the only God; we profess thee to be our King; we call upon thee as our helper. It is from thee we have our victories; by thee we are superior to our enemies. We give thee thanks for the by-past favours and benefits we have already received; and we hope in thee for those that are to come. We are all humble supplicants unto thee, beseeching thee to preserve Constantine our king, with all his pious children, and grant him long to reign over us with safety and victory.' This was the prayer, which he enjoined the Heathens in his army to use every Lord's-day. As for those that were Christians, he commanded them to follow his own example, and attend the prayers of the Church on the Lord's-day, setting them a pattern in his own practice. He ordered his own palace after the manner of a church[38], first taking the Bible into his

[36] De Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 19. (v. 1. p. 636. 4.) *Τοῖς δὲ μήπω τοῦ θείου λόγου μετασχοῦσιν, ἐν δευτέρῳ νόμῳ διεκελεύετο, τὰς κυριακὰς ἡμέρας ἐν προαστείοις ἐπὶ καθαροῦ προϊέναι πεδίου· κἀνταῦθα μεμελετημένην εὐχὴν ἐξ ἑνὸς συνθήματος ὁμοῦ τοὺς πάντας ἀναπέμπειν Θεῷ.*

[37] Ibid. c. 20. (p. ead. 23.) *Σὲ μόνον οἴδαμεν Θεόν· σὲ βασιλέα γνωρίζομεν· σὲ βοηθὸν ἀνακαλούμεθα· παρὰ σοῦ τὰς νίκας ᾑράμεθα· διὰ σοῦ κρείττους τῶν ἐχθρῶν κατέστημεν· σοὶ τὴν τῶν ὑπαρξόντων ἀγαθῶν χάριν γνωρίζομεν· σὲ καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίζομεν· σοῦ πάντες ἱκέται γινόμεθα· τὸν ἡμέτερον βασιλέα Κωνσταντῖνον, παῖδάς τε αὐτοῦ θεοφιλεῖς, ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἡμῖν βίου, σῶον καὶ νικητὴν φυλάττεσθαι ποτνιώμεθα.*

[38] Ibid. c. 17. (ibid. p. 634. 33.) *Ὡς ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ τρόπον διέθετο, σπουδῇ ἐξάρχων αὐτὸς τῶν ἔνδον ἐκκλησιαζομένων· μετὰ χεῖρας γέ τοι λαμβάνων τὰς βίβλους τῇ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λογίων θεωρίᾳ προσανεῖχε τὸν νοῦν· εἶτ' εὐχὰς ἐνθέσμους σὺν τοῖς τὸν βασίλειον οἶκον πληροῦσιν ἀπεδίδου.*

hands, and reading and meditating therein, and then repeating the prescribed prayers with all his royal family: which shows that forms of prayer were then generally used in the Church, since Constantine used the prescribed prayers in his own family, and thereby made it to resemble the Church.

Eusebius highly extols and applauds Constantine for all this: which argués that Eusebius himself was no enemy to prescribed forms. And, indeed, we are beholden to his history both for the knowledge of this of Constantine, and many other forms, which had been lost, had it not been for his care and diligence in preserving them; of which any reader may be sensible, that considers how many things have already been alleged out of his treasury, especially the account which he gives of the Essenes, and their way of worship out of Philo Judæus: for as it is evident that they worshipped God by certain forms, so it is as evident that Eusebius took them for Christians[39], and their worship for the way of worship settled by the first Christians at Alexandria. It may not be improper also to observe, that Eusebius, in one of his Letters recorded by Socrates[40], expressly says, 'that in the Church of Cæsarea, where he was bishop, they always had a creed in a certain form of words, which he there repeats, whereby their catechumens were to be instructed, and their answers in baptism to be made in the words of it: and that thus it was that he himself had been there both catechized and baptized.' And if his Church allowed a form in baptism, there is reason to believe from what has been said, that she was not averse to it in other parts of divine service. Moreover from the time of the Council of Nice, we are well assured, that the Creed composed in that Council was used in most of the Eastern Churches as a precise form, by which all catechumens were to make their responses in baptism, as I have proved elsewhere upon another occasion[41], though it was not presently admitted as a form to be

[39] Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 17. See before, ch. 5. s. 4. p. 379. n. 56.

[40] L. 1. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 23. 6.) Τὸ μὲν οὖν παρ' ἡμῶν γράμμα, ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἡμῶν βασιλέως ἀναγνωσθὲν, εὖ τε ἔχειν καὶ δοκίμως ἀποφανθὲν, τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον. Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, καὶ καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτερείῳ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύσαμέν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες, τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν ὑμῖν προσαναφέρομεν· ἔστι δὲ αὕτη· Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, κ. τ. λ.

[41] B. 10. ch. 4. s. 17. v. 4. p. 542.

repeated, as now it is, in the ordinary service of the Church: but its being allowed as a form in baptism is an argument, that the Church had then no exception against forms, since she enjoined them in the administration of her sacraments, which are the most considerable part of divine service.

Athanasius, as well as Eusebius, was a member of the Council of Nice, and there are plain footsteps of a liturgy in his writings. In one place [41] he declares, 'that when he said, Let us pray for the safety of the most religious Emperor Constantius! all the people immediately with one voice answered, Christ, help Constantius!' Which is exactly agreeable to the ancient way of praying for kings and others in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, where the people were used to answer to every petition, Κύριε ἐλέησον, or σῶσον· *Lord, have mercy upon them!* or *Lord, save and help them!* as will be shown in its proper place. Again, speaking of the communion-service [42], he says, 'The people offered up their prayers with one voice, and without any manner of disagreement; and that in that great multitude there was but one voice when they unanimously answered, Amen!' It is evident also that in his time psalmody was in great request at Alexandria: for Sozomen [43] takes notice, that it was by the advantage of this practice that Athanasius, when he was beset in the church by his enemies, escaped their hands, whilst he got out

[41] Apol. ad Constant. p. 679. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 239 a.) Μόνον γὰρ ἔλεγον, Εὐξώμεθα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου Αὐγούστου Κωνσταντίου καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εὐθὺς μιᾷ φωνῇ ἐβόα, Χριστὲ, βοήθει Κωνσταντίῳ.

[42] Ibid. p. 683. (p. 241 e.) Πῶς ἦν βέλτιον, κατὰ μέρος καὶ διηρημένως τὸν λαὸν μετ' ἐπικινδύνου συνοχῆς, ἢ ὄντος ἤδη τόπου τοῦ δυναμένου δέξασθαι πάντας, ἐν αὐτῷ συνελθεῖν, καὶ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μετὰ συμφωνίας τῶν λαῶν γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν; .... Τί ἐὰν τοσούτων λαῶν συνελθόντων μία γένηται φωνὴ, λεγόντων τῷ Θεῷ, τὸ Ἀμήν.

[43] L. 3. c. 6. (v. 2. p. 100. 32.) Ηδη τε τῶν στρατιωτῶν καταλαβόντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εὐχὴν ἀποτελέσας, πρότερον ψαλμὸν ῥηθῆναι παρεκελεύσατο· συμφώνου δὲ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γενομένης, οἱ στρατιῶται τέως ἡσύχαζον, ὡς οὐκ εὔκαιρον ὂν ἐπιθέσθαι τότε. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ, διαδὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς ψάλλοντας, ἔλαθεν ἐξελθὼν, καὶ εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀνήχθη.—Conf. Socrat. l. 2. c. 11. (ibid. p. 89. 27.).... Καὶ προστάξας διακόνῳ κηρύξαι εὐχὴν, αὖθις ψαλμὸν λέγεσθαι παρεσκεύασε· συμφωνίας δὲ ἐκ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γενομένης, διὰ μιᾶς τῶν πυλῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντες ἐξῄεσαν· τούτου γινομένου, οἱ στρατιῶται ἀπόμαχοι ἔμενον· ὁ δὲ Ἀθανάσιος ἐν μέσοις τοῖς ψαλμῳδοῦσιν ἀβλαβὴς διεσώζετο.—Theodor. l. 2. c. 13. (v. 3. p. 87. 30.) Ἐγὼ δὲ ... καθεσθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου προέτρεπον, τὸν μὲν διάκονον ἀναγινώσκειν ψαλμὸν, τοὺς δὲ λαοὺς ὑπακούειν, ὅτι Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

secretly in the company of those that were singing psalms. St. Austin also speaks of it, and tells us[44], that Athanasius made some regulation in the way of singing, and brought in the custom of plain song, 'ordering the readers of the Psalms to pronounce their words with so little inflexion or variation of the tone, that it looked more like reading than singing.'

It is further observable out of Ruffinus[45] and the other historians, who relate the story of Athanasius baptizing the catechumens whilst he was but a youth, that the questions and answers and all other ceremonies of baptism were then performed by such a certain rule and order in the Church, that Athanasius was able to imitate them exactly, and omit nothing that was used to be done, but observed every rite to a tittle, as Alexander, the bishop, found upon inquiry, when he came more strictly to examine them. And this shows that not only in the time of Athanasius, but in the days of Alexander, his predecessor, such sort of forms were of constant use in the Church. Athanasius himself also not only mentions their psalmody, but tells us that it was so ordered that the people might bear a part in it. For though the antiphonal way of singing verse for verse, by way of alternate song, was not yet brought into the Church in repeating David's Psalms, yet it was usual

[44] Confess. l. 10. c. 33. (t. 1. p. 187 f.) .... Tutiusque mihi videtur, quod de Alexandrino episcopo Athanasio sæpe mihi dictum commemini, qui tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare lectorem psalmi, ut pronuntianti similior [vicinior, Ed. Bened.] esset quam canenti.

[45] L. 1. [al. 10.] c. 14. (p. 230 a. 14.) Tempore, quo apud Alexandriam Petri martyris diem Alexander episcopus agebat, cum, post expleta solemnia, conventuros ad convivium suum clericos exspectaret in loco mari vicino, videt eminus puerorum supra oram maris ludum, imitantium, ut fieri solet, episcopum atque ea, quæ in ecclesiis geri mos est. Sed cum intentius diutine pueros inspectaret, videt ab his geri quædam etiam secretiora et mystica. Perturbatus illico vocari ad se clericos jubet, atque eis, quid eminus ipse videret, ostendit. Tum abire eos, et comprehensos ad se perducere omnes pueros imperat. Cumque adessent, quis eis ludus, et quid egissent, vel quomodo, percunctatur. Illi, ut talis habet ætas, pavidi, negare primo, deinde rem gestam per ordinem pandunt, et baptizatos a se esse quosdam catechumenos confitentur per Athanasium, qui ludi illius puerilis episcopus fuerat simulatus. Tum ille diligenter inquirens ab his, qui baptizati dicebantur, quid interrogati fuerint, quidve responderint, simul et ab eo, qui interrogaverat. Ubi videt secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta constare, collocutus cum concilio clericorum, statuisse traditur, illis, quibus integris interrogationibus et responsionibus aqua fuerat infusa, iterari baptismum non debere, sed adimpleri ea, quæ a sacerdotibus mos est.

sometimes for the people to join in the close of a verse, and repeat it together with the reader. And this was called ὑπηχεῖν and ὑπακούειν, *to come into the concert at the close.* Whence Athanasius [46], speaking of that great assault made upon his church, mentioned before by Socrates and Sozomen, says, he commanded the deacon to read a Psalm, to which the people did ὑπακούειν, that is, not barely *hearken,* as the unskilful translator renders it, but *repeat in the close* these words, "For his mercy endureth for ever!" of which way of singing I shall say more hereafter [47] in its proper place. Here I shall only note further, that Athanasius, describing the great barbarities and indignities which the Arians showed to the matrons and virgins in the very church, mentions [48] one virgin whom they despitefully used, having her psalter in her hand. Which no doubt she had to join in singing David's Psalms, according to the custom of the Church. And the book *De Interpretatione Psalmorum* is nothing else but a direction how to use the Psalms as forms of prayers and praises upon all particular occasions, where [49], among other things, he observes, that the seventy-second or seventy-third Psalm, "O God, my God, early will I seek thee," was always a Psalm to be used at morning prayer. And the author of the book *De Virginitate,* among his works [50], says the same; which is also mentioned by St. Chrysostom and some others about this time, of whom we shall have occasion to speak more particularly [51] in considering the order and method of morning service.

Athanasius lived forty-six years bishop of Alexandria, and continued in being till the year 371. During which interval we have the concurrent testimony of Juvencus and Pachomius, and all the Egyptian monasteries; of Flavian, bishop of An-

[46] Apol. ad Constant. p. 717. [al. Apol. de Fug. n. 24.] (t. 1. part. 1. p. 265 a.) .... Προέτρεπον τὸν μὲν διάκονον ἀναγινώσκειν ψαλμὸν, τοὺς δὲ λαοὺς ὑπακούειν, ὅτι Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. κ. τ. λ.

[47] B. 14. ch. 1. s. 12. [and the notes there, on the words ὑπηχεῖν and ὑπακούειν. Ed.]

[48] Ep. ad Orthodoxos, p. 947. [al. Ep. Encycl. ad Episcopos.] (t. 1. pt. 1. p. 91b.) . . Ἐν οἷς μίαν παρθένον φιλολογοῦσαν, καὶ τὸ ψαλτήριον ἔτι κατέχουσαν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ, μαστιχθῆναι πεποίηκε δημοσίᾳ.

[49] De Interpret. Psalmor. ad Marcellin. t. 1. p. 975. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 794 f. n. 20.) . . . Ἔχων δὲ τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὀρθρίζων, ψάλλε τὸν ἑξηκοστὸν δεύτερον.

[50] De Virgin. p. 1057. (t. 2. p. 93 c. n. 20.) Πρὸς ὄρθρον δὲ τὸν ψαλμὸν τοῦτον λέγετε· Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός μου, πρός σε ὀρθρίζω· ἐδίψησέ σε ἡ ψυχή μου.

[51] See ch. 10. s. 2. of this Book.

tioch, Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, Optatus, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, St. Basil, and Apollinaris, the supposed author of the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, together with the Council of Laodicea; and not long after, of St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, St. Austin, and St. Chrysostom, with several African Councils, all within the compass of this fourth age in which Athanasius lived.

Juvencus flourished under Constantine in Spain, and being a poet, turned the history of the Gospel into verse, and St. Jerom [52] adds, 'that he wrote a book in the same way, giving an account of the order of the sacraments of the Church.' Now if we consider, what has been observed before [53], that in ecclesiastical style *Ordo Sacramentorum* commonly denotes *A Book of Divine Offices*, it is most probable that this work of Juvencus was no other but the offices or forms of divine service turned into verse.

Pachomius, about the year 340, brought the Egyptian monks into communities, and settled them under rules; one of which was to meet twice a day, and sing a certain number of Psalms, with prayers intermixed, as may be seen in the accounts which Cassian [54], Palladius [55], and St. Jerom [56] give of them. Now it must be owned, that whatever their prayers were, their psalmody was matter of form, whether sung singly or alternately; and though they did not repeat the usual doxology, Glory be to the Father! as was usual in the Western Church

[52] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 84. (t. 2. p. 909.) Juvencus, nobilissimi generis Hispanus presbyter, quatuor Evangelia hexametris versibus pene ad verbum transferens, quatuor libros composuit, et nonnulla eodem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia. Floruit sub Constantino principe.

[53] Ch. 1. s. 6. of this Book.

[54] Instit. l. 2. c. 8. (p. 16.) Cumque, sedentibus cunctis .... et in psallentis verba omni cordis intentione defixis, undecim psalmos, orationum interjectione distinctos, contiguis versibus parili pronuntiatione cantasset, duodecimum sub Allelujæ responsione consummans, ab universorum oculis repente subtractus [est].

[55] Hist. Lausiac. c. 38. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 956 d. 2.) Ἐτύπωσε δὲ διὰ πάσης τῆς ἡμέρας ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐχὰς δώδεκα, καὶ ἐν τῷ λυχνικῷ δώδεκα, καὶ ἐν ταῖς παννυχίσι δώδεκα, καὶ ἐννάτην ὥραν τρεῖς. Ὅτε δὲ δοκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἐσθίειν, ἑκάστῳ τάγματι καθ' ἕκάστην εὐχὴν ψαλμὸν προάδεσθαι ἐτύπωσεν.

[56] Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. c. 15. (t. 1. p. 117 c.) Post horam nonam in commune concurritur. Psalmi resonant: Scripturæ recitantur ex more: et, completis orationibus, cunctisque residentibus, medius, quem patrem vocant, incipit disputare.

at the end of every Psalm, yet they did it at other times at the end of their *antiphonas*, as Cassian[57], an eye-witness of their service, informs us.

About the year 350 lived Flavian, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Antioch. Whilst he was presbyter, it happened that Leontius, the Arian bishop, made an alteration in the common doxology, Glory be to the Father, &c.! to make it favour his heresy. Upon this Flavian and Diodorus withdrew from his communion, and assembled with the people at the monuments of the martyrs; where, dividing the people into two parts[58], they taught them to sing the Psalms of David alternately; which custom beginning first at Antioch, was from thence propagated all the world over. After this manner Theodoret relates the story; where it is easy to observe, first, that the form of glorification was an ancient thing, and only Leontius made an innovation in it. Secondly, that the singing of David's Psalms was ancient too, which are forms both of prayers and praises; and Flavian was not the author of that service, but only of the alternate way of singing them. And whereas it is said by Socrates, that Ignatius had introduced the antiphonal way of singing before, that is not to be understood of David's Psalms, but of other hymns composed to the glory of the Holy Trinity; which, as we have seen before, were always in use in the Christian Church. And Theodoret adds, thirdly, that this way of singing was so taking to the people of Antioch, that they all deserted Leontius, and he was forced to beg of Flavian that he would bring back this λειτουργίαν, this *liturgy* or *service*, into the churches.

About the same time lived Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, who, in his Catechetical Discourses to the newly baptized, takes notice of many forms that had been of ancient use in the Church. In his first Catechism[59] he tells them the meaning

[57] Instit. l. 2. c. 8. (p. 20.) Illud etiam, quod in hac provincia vidimus, ut, uno cantante in clausula psalmi, omnes astantes concinant cum clamore, *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto!* nusquam per omnem Orientem audivimus, sed cum omnium silentio ab eo, qui cantat, finito psalmo orationem succedere.

[58] Vid. Theodor. l. 2. c. 24. (v. 3. p. 107. 5.) Οὗτοι πρῶτοι διχῇ διελόντες τοὺς τῶν ψαλλόντων χορούς.

[59] Catech. [19.] Mystag. 1. n. 2. p. 278. (p. 306 d.) Εἰσήειτε πρῶτον εἰς τὸν προαύλιον τοῦ βαπτιστηρίου οἶκον, καὶ πρὸς τὰς δυσμὰς ἑστῶτες ἠκούσατε, καὶ προσετάττεσθε ἐκτείνειν τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ ὡς παρόντι ἀπετάττεσθε τῷ Σατανᾷ.—Ibid. n. 4. p. 279.

of the ceremonies used in baptism: 'Ye were first brought in,' says he, 'into the ante-room of the baptistery, and placed towards the west in a standing posture, and then commanded to renounce Satan, by stretching out your hands against him as if he had been present.' A little after he explains the meaning of their doing this towards the west. 'The west,' says he, 'is the place of darkness, and Satan is darkness, and his strength is in darkness. For this reason ye symbolically look toward the west, when ye renounce that prince of darkness and horror. For what did every one of you then say standing? I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy worship and service.' After this[60] he tells them, 'they turned from the west to the east, which is the region of light and place of Paradise, and then were commanded to say, I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance.' In his second Discourse[61] he reminds them of their unction in the baptistery, and their repeated confession of the Holy Trinity, and their trine immersion. In his third Discourse[62] he treats of the second unction with the holy chrism, which was then used in confirmation, immediately after they were come out of the waters of baptism. In his fifth Discourse[63] he treats of the ceremonies used in

(p. 307 c.) Ἐπειδὴ τοῦ φαινομένου σκότους τόπος [leg. τύπος] αἱ δυσμαί· ἐκεῖνος δὲ σκότος τυγχάνων, ἐν σκότῳ ἔχει καὶ τὸ κράτος· τούτου χάριν συμβολικῶς πρὸς δυσμὰς ἀποβλέποντες, ἀποτάσσεσθε τῷ σκοτεινῷ ἐκείνῳ καὶ ζοφερῷ ἄρχοντι. Τί οὖν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος ἐστὼς ἔλεγεν; Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, . . . καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πομπῇ σου, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου.

[60] Ibid. n. 6. [al. 9.] p. 283. (p. 309 d.) Ὅτε οὖν τῷ Σατανᾷ ἀποτάττῃ, πᾶσαν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντως διαθήκην λύσας, τὰς παλαιὰς πρὸς τὸν ᾅδην συνθήκας, ἀνοίγεταί σοι ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν ἐφύτευσε κατὰ ἀνατολὰς, ὅθεν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν ἐξόριστος γέγονεν ὁ ἡμέτερος προπάτωρ· καὶ τούτου σύμβολον τὸ στραφῆναί σε ἀπὸ δυσμῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν, τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ χωρίον. Τότε σοι ἐλέγετο εἰπεῖν, Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας.

[61] Catech. [20.] Mystag. 2. n. 3. (p. 312 b.) Εἶτα ἀποδυθέντες ἐλαίῳ ἠλείφεσθε ἐπορκιστῷ, ἀπ' ἄκραν τριχῶν κορυφῆς ἕως τῶν κάτω.—Ibid. n. 4. (d.) Καὶ ἠρωτᾶτο ἕκαστος, Εἰ πιστεύει εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος; καὶ ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν, καὶ κατεδύετε τρίτον εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε.

[62] Catech. [21.] Mystag. 3. n. 2. (p. 316 d.) Ὑμεῖς δὲ μύρῳ ἐχρίσθητε, κοινωνοὶ καὶ μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενόμενοι.—Conf. n. 3. tot.

[63] Catech. [23.] Mystag. 5. n. 1. [al. 2.] (p. 325 b.) Ἑωράκατε τοίνυν τὸν διάκονον τὸν νίψασθαι διδόντα τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ τοῖς κυκλοῦσι τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ πρεσβυτέροις. . . . Σύμβολόν ἐστι τοῦ δεῖν ὑμᾶς καθαρεύειν πάντων ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ ἀνομημάτων τὸ νίψασθαι.

the communion-service, where first he speaks of the deacon's bringing water to the bishop and presbyters to wash their hands, in token of men's obligation to purify themselves from sin. 'Then[64] the deacon cries out, Embrace and salute one another with an holy kiss.' 'After this[65] the priest cries out, Lift up your hearts! and ye answer, We lift them up unto the Lord! He says again, Let us give thanks to the Lord! and

[64] Ibid. n. 2. [al. 3.] (p. 326 a.) Εἶτα βοᾷ ὁ διάκονος, Ἀλλήλους ἀπολάβετε, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀσπάζεσθε.

[65] Ibid. n. 3. [al. 4.] (ibid. c.) Μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεὺς, Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας· . . . . εἶτα ἀποκρίνεσθε, Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.—Ibid. n. 4. [al. 5.] (d.) Εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς λέγει, Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ· . . . εἶτα λέγετε, Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον.—Ibid. n. 5. [al. 6.] (p. 327 a.) Μετὰ ταῦτα μνημονεύομεν οὐρανοῦ, καὶ γῆς, καὶ θαλάσσης, ἡλίου, καὶ σελήνης, ἄστρων, καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως λογικῆς τε καὶ ἀλόγου, ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου, ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, δυνάμεων, κυριοτήτων, ἀρχῶν, ἐξουσιῶν, θρόνων, τῶν Χερουβὶμ τῶν πολυπροσωπῶν, δυνάμει λέγοντες* τὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, Μεγαλύνατε τὸν Κύριον σὺν ἐμοί· μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ [al. Σεραφὶμ], ἃ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἐθεάσατο Ἡσαΐας παρεστηκότα κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῖς μὲν δυσὶ πτέρυξι κατακαλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ταῖς δὲ δυσὶ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς δυσὶ πετόμενα, καὶ λέγοντα, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῶν Σεραφὶμ θεολογίαν ταύτην λέγομεν, ὅπως κοινωνοὶ τῆς ὑμνῳδίας ταῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις γενώμεθα στρατιαῖς. Εἶτα ἁγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν, τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ.—Ibid. n. 6. [al. 8.] (p. 327 d.) Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, ὑπὲρ στρατιωτῶν, καὶ συμμάχων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονουμένων, καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς ὑπὲρ πάντων βοηθείας δεομένων· δεόμεθα πάντες ἡμεῖς, καὶ ταύτην προσφέρομεν τὴν θυσίαν.—Ibid. n. 9. (p. 328 a.) Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξηται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν· εἶτα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων, καὶ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων.—Ibid. n. 8. [al. 11.] (d.) Εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν εὐχὴν λέγομεν ἐκείνην, ἣν ὁ Σωτὴρ παρέδωκε τοῖς οἰκείοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς, μετὰ καθαρᾶς συνειδήσεως Πατέρα ἐπιγραφόμενοι τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ λέγοντες, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. n. 16. [al. 19.] (p. 331 a.) Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις· . . . . εἶτα ὑμεῖς λέγετε, Εἷς ἅγιος, εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.—Ibid. n. 17. [al. 20.] (b.) Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀκούετε τοῦ ψάλλοντος μετὰ μέλους θείου, προτρεπομένου ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, καὶ λέγοντος, Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος.—Ibid. n. 18. [al. 21.] (d.) Δέχου τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐπιλέγων τὸ Ἀμήν.—Ibid. n. 19. [al. 22.] (p. 332 b.) Προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος . . . . λέγων τὸ Ἀμὴν . . . . εἶτα ἀναμείνας τὴν εὐχὴν, εὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ τῷ καταξιώσαντί σε τῶν τηλικούτων μυστηρίων.

* [I have adopted throughout these citations of Cyril the readings of the Benedictine Edition which do not alter the sense. Instead of τῶν τὸ πρόσωπον δυνάμει καλυπτόντων, λέγοντες κ. τ. λ., the variation is, as I have printed, τῶν πολυπροσώπων, δυνάμει λέγοντες, κ. τ. λ. Vid. not. in loco. Ed.]

ye answer, It is meet and just so to do! After this we make mention of heaven, and earth, and sea, the sun, moon and stars, and the whole creation, rational and irrational, visible and invisible, angels and archangels, dignities, dominions, principalities and powers, thrones and cherubims, and with them we sing the seraphical hymn, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth! After which we beseech the merciful God that he would send forth his Spirit upon the elements, and make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. Then after this spiritual and unbloody sacrifice and service is performed, we beseech God for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings and their armies and allies, for the sick and afflicted; and, in a word, for all that want assistance, saying, We beseech thee for them, and offer this sacrifice unto thee. Then we make mention of those that are fallen asleep, first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God, through their prayers and intercessions, may receive our prayers; and after we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and all that are departed this life before us; then we say that prayer which our Saviour gave to his disciples, calling God by the name of Father, and saying, Our Father which art in heaven, &c. After which the priest says, Holy things for those that are holy. And the people answer, There is One Holy, One Lord Jesus Christ. Then one is appointed to sing those words of the thirty-third Psalm, O taste and see that the Lord is gracious! as an excitement to receive the communion; and every one communicates, saying Amen! twice; first, when he receives the body of Christ into his hand, and afterward, [when he takes] the cup of his blood. Finally, when all have communicated, he tells them they are to wait for prayer again, and give God thanks for making them partakers of so great mysteries.'

Now one must be blind that cannot see the plain footsteps and forms of a stated liturgy in all this. And therefore I shall make no other descant upon them, but only this, that undoubtedly before St. Cyril wrote these Lectures there was a prescribed liturgy, and offices in form, for the administration both of baptism and the eucharist in the Church of Jerusalem, and those handed down from their forefathers, though it be not possible to trace every thing precisely to its first original.

Contemporary with Cyril was Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, of whom St. Jerom[66] says, 'that he wrote a book of hymns and mysteries,' which most probably were the forms of the holy offices then used in the Church. It is certain his hymns, together with those of St. Ambrose, were afterwards in great request in the Church; and when some excepted against them, as only of human composition, the fourth Council of Toledo[67] ordered them 'to be retained in the Church's service, together with the hymns, Glory be to the Father! and Glory be to God on high! threatening excommunication to any who in the Churches of Spain and Gallicia should reject them.' Hilary himself plainly intimates, that both the prayers and hymns were such, as all the people with an audible voice might join in them. 'Let every profane hearer,' says he[68], 'be terrified with the words of our confession. Let us fight against the Devil and his weapons with the sound of our prayers, and let the victory of our war be proclaimed with the voice of exultation! Let him that stands without the church hear the voice of the people praying; let him perceive the glorious sound of our hymns, and hear the responses of our devout confession in the offices of the divine sacraments.'

He that can make out all this from the people's silent consent in heart only to the minister's prayer, without any vocal joining in forms of prayer and praises, may make any thing out of any thing, and it were not worth while to produce any manner of evidence for such a man's conviction. I only note

[66] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 100. (t. 2. p. 919.) Et liber hymnorum et mysteriorum alius.

[67] C. 12. [al. 13.] (t. 5. p. 1709 e.) Quia a nonnullis [al. nonnulli] hymni humano studio in laudem Dei, atque Apostolorum et martyrum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut hi quos beatissimi doctores, Hilarius atque Ambrosius, ediderunt, quos tamen quidam specialiter reprobant pro eo quod de Scripturis sanctorum canonum, vel Apostolica traditione non existunt. .... Sicut igitur orationes, ita et hymnos in laudem Dei compositos, nullus vestrum ulterius improbet, sed pari modo in Gallicia [al. Gallia] Hispaniaque celebret: excommunicatione plectendi, qui hymnos rejicere fuerint ausi.

[68] In Ps. 65. p. 232. (t. 1. p. 196 c. n. 4.) Terrendus ergo est confessionis nostræ sermone omnis profanus auditor: et adversus Diabolum, armaque ejus orationum nostrarum sonitu certandum est, et belli nostri victoria exultationis voce monstranda est. Audiat orantis populi consistens quis extra ecclesiam vocem; spectet celebres hymnorum sonitus; et inter divinorum quoque sacramentorum officia responsionem devotæ confessionis accipiat.

further out of Hilary[69], that these prayers and hymns were both for morning and evening service. The Church had her outgoings, both morning and evening, to praise God: she began the day with prayers, and ended the day with hymns to God.

Chronologers are not exactly agreed about the time of the Council of Laodicea. Labbe and others place it before the Council of Nice, about the year 319; Bp. Beveridge about the year 365: but on all hands it is agreed to be within this century. Now here are several canons, which plainly show the use of prescribed forms in the service of the Church. The seventh canon[70] orders, 'that such as returned from the heresies of the Novatians, the Photinians, and the Quartadecimans, should first learn the Creeds of the Church, and be anointed with the holy chrism, before they were admitted to the communion of the holy mysteries.' Which implies that the Creeds were then in a certain form, since they were obliged to learn them. The fifteenth canon[71] orders, 'that none should sing in the church except the canonical singers, who went up into the *ambo*, or *reading desk*, and sang *from a book*, ἀπὸ διφθέρας.' The seventeenth canon[72] forbids the continuing of Psalms one after another, and orders a lesson to be read after every Psalm. The eighteenth[73] orders the same liturgy of prayers to be used at the Nones, that is, three o'clock in the afternoon, and at evening service. The nineteenth[74] orders the method of divine

[69] In Ps. 64. p. 231. (ibid. p. 190 e. n. 12.) Progressus ecclesiæ in matutinum [leg. matutinorum] et vespertinorum hymnorum delectationes maximum misericordiæ Dei signum est. Dies in orationibus Dei inchoatur, dies hymnis Dei clauditur.

[70] C. 7. (t. 1. p. 1497 a.) Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν αἱρέσεων, τοῦτ' ἔστι, Ναυατιανῶν, ἤ τοι Φωτεινιανῶν, ἢ Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατιτῶν ἐπιστρεφομένους...ἐκμανθάνοντας τὰ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολα, χρισθέντας τε τῷ ἁγίῳ χρίσματι, οὕτω κοινωνεῖν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ [al. τῶν μυστηρίων τῶν ἁγίων.]

[71] C. 15. (ibid. p. 1500 a.) Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ δεῖν πλέον τῶν κανονικῶν ψαλτῶν, τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα ἀναβαινόντων, καὶ ἀπὸ διφθέρας ψαλλόντων, ἑτέρους τινὰς ψάλλειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.

[72] C. 17. (ibid. b.) Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ δεῖν ἐπισυνάπτειν ἐν ταῖς συνάξεσι τοὺς ψαλμοὺς, ἀλλὰ διὰ μέσου καθ' ἕκαστον ψαλμὸν γίνεσθαι ἀνάγνωσιν.

[73] C. 18. (ibid. b.) Περὶ τοῦ, τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν εὐχῶν πάντοτε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐννάταις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις ὀφείλειν γίνεσθαι.

[74] C. 19. (ibid. c.) Περὶ τοῦ, δεῖν ἰδίᾳ πρῶτον μετὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχὴν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι· καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς κατηχουμένους, τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὴν εὐχὴν γίνεσθαι· καὶ τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα, καὶ ὑποχωρησάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐ-

service, 'that after the bishop's sermon should follow the prayers for the catechumens; and after they were gone, the prayers for the penitents; and when they had been under the bishop's hand, and were retired, then the three prayers for the faithful or communicants; the first whereof were to be in silence, the second and third by way of bidding prayer and audible invocation. Then the presbyters were to give the kiss of peace to the bishop, and laymen to one another; after which the holy oblation was to be made, those only who were of the clergy communicating within the rails of the altar. This canon plainly describes the order and method of the ancient service, as it was performed in that age; and though the several forms of prayer here mentioned are not set down, yet we are sure they were in use at that time, and therefore a brief reference, such as was suitable to the compass of a short canon, is made to them, as shall be shown more at large in another place[75]. The twenty-second canon[76] orders 'that the subdeacon shall not wear the *orarium;*' which was a scarf or tippet belonging to the deacons, by which they were used to give the signal or directions to the people in the performance of the several parts of divine service. The forty-sixth canon[77] orders those that are to be baptized to learn the Creed, and on the Thursday before Easter to rehearse it to the bishop or presbyters. The forty-seventh canon[78] appoints those, that were baptized in sickness, afterwards to learn the Creed also; which implies, that the Creed was then in a certain form of words. The fifty-ninth canon[79] orders that no psalms composed by private men should be sung in the church; which argues that hymns composed by private men were only to be discarded, but others were allowed

χὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς· μίαν μὲν τὴν πρώτην διὰ σιωπῆς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην διὰ προσφωνήσεως πληροῦσθαι, εἶθ' οὕτως τὴν εἰρήνην δίδοσθαι. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πρεσβυτέρους δοῦναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τὴν εἰρήνην, τότε λαϊκοὺς τὴν εἰρήνην διδόναι· καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ μόνοις ἐξὸν εἶναι τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ κοινωνεῖν.

[75] B. 15. ch. 1. in the next vol.

[76] C. 22. (ibid. e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην ὡράριον φορεῖν.

[77] C. 46. (ibid. p. 1504 e.) Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς φωτιζομένους τὴν πίστιν ἐκμανθάνειν, καὶ τῇ πέμπτῃ ἑβδομάδος ἀπαγγέλλειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.

[78] C. 47. (ibid. p. 1505 a.) Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβάνοντας τὸ φώτισμα, καὶ εἶτα ἀναστάντας, ἐκμανθάνειν τὴν πίστιν.

[79] [C. 59. (ibid. p. 1507 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. *Grischov.*]

that were authentic. And this is full proof that forms of divine service were in use at the time of this Council.

About the year 368, Epiphanius was made bishop of Salamis, or Constantia, in Cyprus. And that he approved forms of prayer appears from the frequent testimony he gives to the book called the Apostolical Constitutions, the Eighth Book of which is nothing but a collection of such forms. Cotelerius [80] has compared the several places in the Constitutions with those, that Epiphanius alleges out of them, and showed them to be the same in substance: particularly he observes, that Epiphanius in one place [81] gives the Constitutions this character, 'that they contain all canonical order, and nothing contrary to the faith, or confession, or the administration and rules of the Church;' which no man could say, that did not approve of the several forms of worship contained therein. And therefore when Epiphanius says, in another place [82], 'that the Church observed her morning hymns and prayers, and her evening psalms and prayers,' it is reasonable to suppose that all these were according to prescribed forms, as it is certain at least the psalms and hymns were. But there is one place in Epiphanius's Epistle to John, bishop of Jerusalem, which evidently proves, that the communion service was then performed by a prescribed office and form. For Epiphanius [83] having been accused to John, as if he had reflected on him in his prayers,

[80] Testimonia Veterum præfixa Constitutionibus Apostolicis, (v. 1. pp. 189, 190.)

[81] Hær. 70. Audian. n. 10. (t. 1. p. 822 a, b.) Πᾶσα γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ κανονικὴ τάξις ἐμφέρεται, καὶ οὐδὲν παρακεχαραγμένον τῆς πίστεως, οὐδὲ τῆς ὁμολογίας, οὐδὲ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διοικήσεως, καὶ κανόνος, καὶ πίστεως.

[82] Expos. Fid. n. 23. (t. 1. p. 1106 a.) Ἑωθινοί τε ὕμνοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ διηνεκεῖς γίνονται, καὶ προσευχαὶ ἑωθιναὶ, λυχνικοί τε ἅμα ψαλμοὶ, καὶ προσευχαί.

[83] Ep. ad Ioan. Hierosol. (t. 2. p. 313 b, c.) Illud quoque audiens admiratus sum, quod quidam, qui solent ultro citroque portare rumusculos, et his, quæ audierunt, semper addere, ut tristitias et rixas inter fratres concitent, te quoque turbaverunt, et dixerunt, quod in oratione, quando offerimus sacrificia Deo, soleamus pro te dicere, *Domine, præsta Ioanni, ut recte credat.* Noli nos in tantum putare rusticos, ut hoc tam aperte dicere potuerimus. Quanquam enim hoc in corde meo semper orem, tamen, ut simpliciter fatear, nunquam in alienas aures protuli, ne te viderer parvi pendere, dilectissime. Quando autem complemus orationem secundum ritum mysteriorum et pro omnibus, et pro te quoque dicimus, Custodi illum, qui prædicat veritatem! vel certe ita, Tu præsta, Domine, et custodi, ut ille verbum prædicet veritatis! sicut occasio sermonis se tulerit, et habuerit oratio consequentiam.

saying thus, 'Lord grant that John may believe aright!' to clear himself of this accusation he denies that ever he prayed so for him in public, though he did so privately in his heart, and for the truth of this, he appeals to the words of the communion-offices then in public use: 'When we offer up prayers in the communion-office,' says he, 'we use these words for all bishops, and for you also: *Keep him, who preacheth the truth!* or certainly thus, *Lord, grant our requests, and keep him, that he may preach the word of truth!* as the occasion of the words requires, and as the order of the office for prayer directs.' To understand which aright, we are to consider, that anciently in the communion-service there were two prayers, where bishops were prayed for, one in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church before the oblation, and the other in the prayer immediately after the oblation, when all states of men were again solemnly commemorated and recommended to God; as we shall see hereafter. Now in reference to these two prayers, Epiphanius says, they prayed either thus or thus, as the occasion of the words required, and the order of the office directed. Which is a manifest reference to the two prayers, in which these words were contained, and as plain an argument for prescribed forms, as can be required. And indeed the word *consequentia*, which in Greek no doubt was ἀκολουθία, shows as much: for that always signified *a stated or prescribed order of prayers.* Of which the reader may find examples enough in the Thesaurus of Suicer, or the Glossary of Meursius, which need not here be inserted.

Optatus, bishop of Milevis, was contemporary with Epiphanius; and he has a great many plain references to the forms then used in the public service. He tells the Donatists[84], 'that by confining the Church to their own party, they had frustrated the intent of the Holy Spirit, which had presignified, that the name of God should be praised with psalms and hymns over all the earth, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof; and that in effect they had defrauded God of his praise. For if they only were the true Church that was

[84] L. 2. p. 47. (p. 34.) Fraudatis aures Dei: si vos soli laudatis, totus tacebit orbis, qui est ab ortu solis usque ad occasum. Clausistis ora omnium Christianarum gentium: indixistis silentium populis universis, Deum per momenta laudare cupientibus, &c.

to praise him, the rest of the world, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, must be silent. They had shut the mouth of Christian nations, and imposed silence upon all people, however desirous to praise God at the proper seasons.' Which manifestly implies, that psalmody was then a part of the people's devotions all the world over, and that the Donatists were injurious to God, whose principles tended to defraud him of it. Again he speaks of the prayer for the whole Church in the time of the oblation, as a form so firmly established by law, that the Donatists themselves would not venture to make any alteration in it. 'Who doubts,' says he [85], 'but that you continue to use that settled form of words in the celebration of the sacrament, and never omit to say, that you offer for that one Church which is diffused over all the world?' He says the same of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the communion-service, that the Donatists continued to use it as well as the Catholics: for he observes [86], 'that though they gave imposition of hands and absolution to sinners in such an haughty and supercilious manner, as if they themselves had had no sin; yet not long after, when they turned to the altar, they could not omit the Lord's Prayer, wherein they said, Forgive us our trespasses and sins.' 'The Lord's Prayer,' he says [87], 'was of one and the same use with them both.' He says also [88], 'the common form of salutation, established by law, was likewise retained by the Donatists: for they could not omit saying, Peace be with you! They retained the name when they had lost the substance.' He says further [89], 'that the Catholics and Donatists used the same interrogatories in baptism: they

[85] Ibid. p. 53. (p. 45.) Quis dubitet vos illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio præterire non posse? Offerre vos dicitis pro una ecclesia, quæ sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa.

[86] Ibid. p. 57. (pp. 51, 52.) Etenim inter vicina momenta, dum manus imponitis et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, Dominicam Orationem prætermittere non potestis, &c.

[87] Ibid. 3. p. 72. (p. 78.) Oratio Dominica apud nos et apud vos una est.

[88] Ibid. p. 73. (p. 79.) Et non potuistis prætermittere quod legitimum est. Utique dixistis, *Pax vobiscum* ..... Quid salutas, de quo non habes? Quid nominas quod exterminasti? Salutas de pace, qui non amas.

[89] L. 5. p. 86. (p. 102.) Quocunque enim interrogante, qui credidit, Deo credidit: et post illius unum *Credo*, tu exigis alterum *Credo*.—Ibid. p. 89. (p. 106.) Interrogemus alterum gentilem, an renuntiet Diabolo et credat Deo? Et dicat, *Renuntio et credo*.

asked the catechumen, Whether he renounced the Devil? And whether he believed in God? And he answered, I renounce, I believe. Only the Donatists did one thing amiss, in repeating these things over again, and rebaptizing those whom the Catholics had baptized before.' He seems also to hint something of the ancient form of exorcizing catechumens before baptism, when he tells the Donatists[90], that by rebaptizing Catholics, who were already baptized, and in whom God dwelt, they said in effect to God, 'Go out thou cursed one.' For this was the phrase then used in exorcism, which was a prayer, as St. Cyril[91] calls it, for expelling Satan out of the catechumens: and these words of Optatus seem plainly to be taken out of the prayers of exorcism, then commonly used in the Church. There is one thing more very observable in Optatus: he says[92], 'a rumour was once spread in Afric, that the emperor's officers were to come and make strange alterations in the church, by placing images upon the altar in time of divine service. Which flying report put the people into great consternation and confusion. But they were presently quieted again, when they saw those officers come, and no such alterations made by them; but the ancient purity and solemn custom and usual rites were still observed, and nothing was either changed, or added, or diminished in the divine sacrifice.' Which shows, that the public service was then in a certain form, and not left to every man's liberty to make alterations in it, or lengthen or shorten it, by adding or diminishing at his pleasure.

[90] L. 4. p. 79. (p. 93.) .... Vos rebaptizando exorcizatis hominem fidelem, et dicitis Deo habitanti, *Maledicte, exi foras.*

[91] Catech. 16. n. 9. [al. 19.] p. 234. (p. 254 c.) Πολλάκις ὁ δαίμων, ὁ σιδηραίοις δεσμοῖς ὑπὸ πολλῶν μὴ κρατούμενος, λόγοις εὐχῆς ἐκρατήθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ δύναμιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

[92] L. 3. p. 75. (p. 82.) Dicebatur enim illo tempore, venturos esse Paulum et Macarium, qui interessent sacrificio, ut, cum altaria solemniter aptarentur, proferrent illi imaginem, quam primo in altari ponerent, et sic sacrificium offerretur. Hoc cum acciperent aures, perculsi sunt et animi, et uniuscujusque lingua in hæc verba commota est, ut omnis, cum hoc audierat, diceret, *Qui inde gustat, de sacro gustat.* Et recte dictum erat, si talem famam similis veritas sequeretur. At ubi ventum est supradictis, nihil tale visum esse ex eo, quod fuerat paullo ante mentita fama: nihil viderunt oculi Christiani, quod horrerent: nihil probavit aspectus ex iis, quibus perturbatus erat auditus. Visa est puritas, et ritu solito solemnis consuetudo perspecta est; cum viderent divinis sacrificiis, nec mutatum quidquam, nec additum, nec ablatum.

About the year 370 St. Basil was made bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, but before he was a bishop he lived a presbyter in the same Church under Eusebius, his predecessor in the see. During which time, as Nazianzen [93] assures us, among other services done for that Church, he composed forms of prayer and orders of decency for the communion service, which, by the consent and authority of his bishop, Eusebius, were used in the Church. We are not bound to assert, that any of the Liturgies, which now go under his name, are exactly the same with that. It is certain they have received many additions and alterations, and in many things differ from one another: and some things are alleged by ancient writers out of St. Basil's genuine Liturgy, which a learned man [94] assures us are not to be found at present in any of these. As that prayer, which is cited by Petrus Diaconus, who lived about the year 520, in whose time St. Basil's Liturgy was used almost all the East over. For he says [95], among other things, they then prayed thus, according to St. Basil's Liturgy: 'Grant us, Lord, thy defence and protection; we beseech thee, make the evil to become good, and keep those that are good in their goodness. For all things are possible unto thee, and no one can contradict thee: when thou pleasest, thou canst save and there is no one that can resist thy will.' Some fancy these words are to be found in the present copies, but whether that be so or not, we may be pretty well assured they were in the original Liturgy of St. Basil, whence the author cites them. And that is an argument, that St. Basil composed a Liturgy, which was then of general use in the East, and known to the Africans also.

Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, was within half an age of St. Basil's time, and he gives this account [96] of his composing

[93] Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 340 d.)—Εὐχῶν διατάξεις καὶ εὐκοσμία τοῦ βήματος, &c.

[94] Cave, Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 194.) Hæc quidem Liturgia, prout exstat hodie, plurimum est interpolata, variis additamentis pro sæculi, quo facta sunt, genio et conditione aucta: adeoque ejus exemplaria, quo vetustiora, eo breviora et castiora reperiuntur.

[95] De Incarnatione, inter Fulgentii Opera, c. 8. p. 633. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 198 d. 7.)...Basilius Cæsariensis ad Episcopum in oratione sacri altaris, quam pene universus frequentat Oriens, inter cætera, *Dona* inquit, *Domine, virtutem ac tutamentum; malos, quæsumus, bonos facito; bonos in bonitate conserva: omnia enim potes, et non est qui contradicat tibi; cum enim volueris, salvas, et nullus resistit voluntati tuæ.*

[96] De Traditione Divinæ Liturgiæ, cited by Comber of Liturgies,

a Liturgy: 'St. Basil, seeing men's sloth and degeneracy made them weary of a long liturgy, thought there was nothing unnecessary or tedious in that of St. James, which was used before; yet to prevent the weariness of priests and people, he delivered a shorter form.' And it is also cited under St. Basil's name by Leontius [97], and the Council of Trullo [98]. So that though many things be inserted into the present copies of St. Basil's Liturgy, and others wanting in them; yet these are no arguments against the original composition, of which there is such clear evidence in the ancient writers.

But St. Basil not only composed a form for the communion-service, but often speaks of other forms as generally used upon other occasions. In his sixty-third Epistle [99] he gives a large account of the people's joining in alternate psalmody and prayers, and of their repeating the psalm of confession, that is the fifty-first Psalm, at morning prayer. And he there also [1] speaks of the Liturgy of Gregory Thaumaturgus with approbation, and of the Litanies, which the Church of Neocæsarea had admitted since the time of Gregory. In his two hundred and forty-first Epistle [2] he mentions several particulars of the

part. 2. ch. 4. (p. 168.) [Græce, ap. Galland. (t. 9. p. 680 a.) Ὁ δὲ μέγας Βασίλειος μετὰ ταῦτα, τὸ ῥάθυμον καὶ καταφερὲς τῶν ἀνθρώπων θεωρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῆς λειτουργίας μῆκος ὀκνούντων, ταύτην οὐ περιττὴν καὶ μακρὰν εἶναι νομίζων, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν συνευχομένων τε καὶ ἀκροωμένων ῥάθυμον διὰ τὸ παλὺ [leg. πολὺ] τοῦ χρόνου παρανάλωμα ἐκκόπτων, ἐπιτομώτερον παρέδωκε λέγεσθαι· κ. τ. λ.—Conf. Latine ap. Bibl. Max. (t. 6. p. 617 d.) Postea vero Basilius Magnus, cum hominum liturgiæ prolixitatem fastidientium oscitantiam et propensionem perspiceret, non quod longam et prolixam eam esse arbitraretur, sed ut tam audientium quam una orantium commodo consuleret, eorumque socordiam ex longioris temporis mora promanantem castigaret penitusque tolleret, redactam in compendium recitandam exhibuit. Ed.]

[97] Cont. Nestor. l. 3. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 4. part. 2. p. 1006. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 697 c. 4. . . .Illam [Missam] Magni Basilii in eodem spiritu conscriptam. . . .

[98] C. 32. (t. 6. p. 1158 b.) Καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἰάκωβος, ὁ κατὰ σάρκα Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς, ὃς τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἐκκλησίας πρώτως τὸν θρόνον ἐπιστεύθη· καὶ Βασίλειος, ὁ τῆς Καισαρέων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, οὗ τὸ κλέος κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διέδραμεν, ἐγγράφως τὴν μυστικὴν ἡμῖν ἱερουργίαν παραδεδωκότες, οὕτω τελειοοῦν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ ἐξ ὕδατός τε καὶ οἴνου τὸ ἱερὸν ποτήριον ἐκδεδώκασι.

[99] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. See before, ch. 4. s. 2. p. 345. n. 75.

[1] See before, ch. 5. s. 6. p. 399. n. 24.

[2] Ep. 241. [al. 155.] (t. 3. part. 2. p. 353 c.) Μέμνησαι γὰρ πάντως τῶν κηρυγμάτων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, πιστὸς ὢν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι· ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀποδημίαις ἀδελφῶν δεόμεθα, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ταῖς στρατίαις ἐξεταζομένων, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν παρρησιαζομένων διὰ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τοὺς πνευματικοὺς καρποὺς ἐπιδεικνυμένων, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰς εὐχὰς ποιούμεθα.

usual prayer for the whole state of the Church, telling his friend, whom he writes to, 'that he must needs remember them in the deacon's bidding prayer, for all that were gone to travel; for the soldiers; for all that profess the name of Christ, &c.' Which, as I shall show hereafter[3], were the usual forms of supplication in the prayers for all states of men in the Church. In his sixty-eighth Epistle[4] he mentions other forms, which were as evidently parts of the ancient liturgies: 'We pray that the rest of our days may continue in peace; we desire that our death may also be in peace.' We have heard him before[5] speak of the Hymns of Athenogenes, and the evening hymn to the Holy Trinity. And we shall hear him hereafter[6] speaking of particular psalms appointed for particular hours of canonical prayer. All which are such manifest indications of the use of stated forms, that nothing but prejudice can incline a man to except against them.

Gregory Nazianzen was St. Basil's dear friend, and of him it were enough to say, that he commends his friend for making forms of prayer for the use of the Church, as we have heard already. But he also says[7] his own father consecrated the eucharist with the solemn words, that were wont to be used upon that occasion. And speaking of Julian the Apostate, he says[8], 'he admired the Church for her forms of worship, which were anciently delivered and still preserved among them:' and therefore he intended that his Heathen priests should imitate the Christians, and[9] 'have a form of prayers in parts,' that is, prayers so composed as that the people might make their responses.

Which is also taken notice of by Sozomen, who says[10], that Julian, admiring the order of Christian worship, appointed that the Heathen temples should be adorned after the same

[3] B. 15. ch. 1. s. 3., in the next vol.

[4] Ep. 68. [al. 97.] ad Senat. Tyan. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 274 c.) Ἐν εἰρήνῃ μένειν τὰς λειπομένας ἡμῶν ἡμέρας εὐχόμεθα· ἐν εἰρήνῃ δὲ γενέσθαι τὴν κοίμησιν ἡμῶν αἰτοῦμεν.

[5] Ch. 2. of this Book, s. 2. p. 296.

[6] Regul. Major. quæst. 37. in respons. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 536 b. n. 3.) Τὸν μὲν ὄρθρον, κ. τ. λ.

[7] Orat. 19. (t. 1. p. 305 b.) Εἶτα ἐπειπὼν τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ῥήματα οὕτως ὡς συνηθὲς, κ. τ. λ.

[8] Orat. 3. (ibid. p. 101 c.) ... Τοῖς παραδεδομένοις καὶ εἰς τόδε τετηρημένοις τύποις τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[9] Ibid. (p. 102 a.)... Εὐχῶν τε τύπον ἐν μέρει.

[10] L. 5. c. 16. (v. 2. p. 203. 9.) Διενοεῖτο πανταχῇ τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ναοὺς τῇ παρασκευῇ καὶ τῇ τάξει τῆς Χριστιανῶν θρησκείας διακοσμεῖν ... ὡρῶν τε ῥητῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν τεταγμέναις εὐχαῖς, κ. τ. λ.

manner, 'with prescribed prayers upon set days and hours.' Nazianzen also mentions the usual form of renouncing the Devil in baptism, and the solemn covenant or compact made with Christ, which, he says[11], they did, *καὶ τοῖς σχήμασι καὶ τοῖς ῥήμασι, both by words and gestures*, that is, renouncing the Devil with their faces to the west, and then turning about to the east, by which they signified their turning to Christ, the Sun of righteousness. Both which words and gestures were evidently matter of form and ecclesiastical prescription. As was also the form of professing their faith, the triple immersion, and many other such rites and observances, which we meet with in Nazianzen and all other ecclesiastical writers almost, that have any occasion to speak of the ancient manner of administering baptism.

There is one author more, who was famous about this time, before the death of Athanasius, which was Ephrem, deacon of Edessa, commonly called the Prophet of the Syrians. Theodoret[12] says, 'that he composed a great many hymns, in opposition to those that had been formerly made by Harmonius, the son of Bardesanes, the heretic, and that they were used upon the festivals of the martyrs.' Sozomen[13] mentions 'his divine hymns' also, as well as 'those that were made upon the martyrs.' And these no doubt were some of those famous writings of his, which St. Jerom[14] says were used to be rehearsed in the church after the reading of the Scriptures.

Here it will not be improper also to observe, that the

[11] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 671 a.) Γνώσῃ καὶ τοῖς σχήμασι καὶ τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὡς ὅλην ἀποπέμπῃ τὴν ἀθείαν, οὕτως ὅλῃ θεότητι συντασσόμενος.

[12] Lib. 4. c. 29. (v. 3. p. 187. 18.) Καὶ ἐπειδὴ Ἁρμόνιος ὁ Βαρδησάνου ᾠδάς τινας συντεθείκει πάλαι, καὶ τῇ τοῦ μέλους ἡδονῇ τὴν ἀσέβειαν κεράσας, κατεκήλει τοὺς ἀκούοντας, καὶ πρὸς ὄλεθρον ἤγρευε, τὴν ἁρμονίαν τοῦ μέλους ἐκεῖθεν λαβὼν ἀνέμιξε τὴν εὐσέβειαν, καὶ προσενήνοχε τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἥδιστον ὁμοῦ καὶ ὀνησιφόρον φάρμακον· ταῦτα καὶ νῦν τὰ ἄσματα, φαιδροτέρας τῶν νικηφόρων μαρτύρων τὰς πανηγύρεις ποιεῖ.

[13] L. 3. c. 16. (v. 2. p. 120. 20.) Ἰδὼν δὲ Ἐφραὶμ κηλουμένους τοὺς Σύρους τῷ κάλλει τῶν ὀνομάτων, καὶ τῷ ῥυθμῷ τῆς μελῳδίας, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο προσεθιζομένους ὁμοίως αὐτῷ δοξάζειν, καίπερ Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἄμοιρος, ἐπέστη τῇ καταλήψει τῶν Ἁρμονίου μέτρων· καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλη τῶν ἐκείνου γραμμάτων, ἑτέρας γραφὰς συνᾳδούσας τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς δόγμασι συνέθηκεν· ὁποῖα αὐτῷ πεπόνητο ἐν θείοις ὕμνοις κα ἐγκωμίοις ἀπαθῶν ἀνδρῶν· ἐξ ἐκείνου τε Σύροι κατὰ τὸν νόμον τῆς Ἁρμονίου ᾠδῆς τὰ τοῦ Ἐφραὶμ ψάλλουσι.

[14] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 115. (t. 2. p. 929.) Ad tantam venit claritatem [al. claritudinem], ut post lectionem Scripturarum publice in quibusdam ecclesiis ejus scripta recitentur.

practice of heretics in endeavouring to corrupt and alter the ancient forms of the Church, is often a manifest evidence and testimony of the antiquity of them. Thus Theodoret [15] takes notice, that in the beginning of this century, Arius, 'transgressing the ancient laws of giving glory to God, which had been handed down by those who lived and served in the ministry of the word from the beginning, introduced a new form, teaching those whom he deceived, to say, Glory be to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost! And that, though he did not presume to alter the form of baptizing *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, yet he forbad to use the glorification according to the rule of baptism.' Does not this prove, that the form of this doxology was long before Arius, since he presumed to introduce a new one? So again, when the same Theodoret [16] tells us, 'that Eunomius subverted the ancient law of baptism, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and brought in a contrary law, that men should not be baptized with a triple immersion, nor by invocation of the Trinity, but only by a single immersion in the name of Christ:' does not this innovation as plainly prove, that the rite of trine immersion was the ancient form and custom of the Church? As Tertullian [17], and all that speak of it before Eunomius, have constantly asserted. So that, whether we consider the testimonies of the Catholics, or the practices and innovations made by heretics, they both concur to prove, that within this period of time, viz. during the life of Athanasius, the Church made use of forms in

[15] Hæret. Fabul. l. 4. c. 1. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 350.) Οὗτος [Ἄρειος] καὶ τῆς δοξολογίας τοὺς νόμους καταλιπὼν, οὓς οἱ ἐξαρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ Λόγου παρέδοσαν, ἕτερον ἐπεισήγαγε τύπον, δοξάζειν τοὺς ἐξηπατημένους διδάξας τὸν Πατέρα διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος γινομένην ἐπίκλησιν ἐναλλάξαι διὰ τὸ τῆς παραβάσεως προφανὲς οὐκ ἐθάρρησεν· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν Δεσποτικὴν ἐντολὴν, βαπτίζειν μὲν παρέδωκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· δοξάζειν δὲ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος διεκώλυσε νόμον, κ. τ. λ.

[16] Ibid. c. 3. (p. 356.) Αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος ἀνέτρεψα τὸν ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Ἀποστόλων παραδοθέντα θεσμὸν, καὶ ἄντικρυς ἀντενομοθέτησε, μὴ χρῆναι λέγων τρὶς καταδύειν τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, μηδὲ ποιεῖσθαι τὴν τῆς Τριάδος ἐπίκλησιν· ἀλλ' ἅπαξ βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[17] Cont. Prax. c. 26. (p. 516 b.) Nec semel, sed ter ad singula nomina, in personas singulas tinguimur. —De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Ter mergitamur.—Conf. Can. Apost. 49. al. 50. (Cotel. [c. 42.] v. 1. p. 444.)—Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλ' ἓν βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω.

every considerable part of divine service, baptism, psalmody, and the most solemn worship at the Lord's table. And so she did also in her funeral rites, where nothing is more common than to hear of psalmody in their solemn processions to any interment, as may be seen in the writings of Gregory Nazianzen [19], and the Constitutions [20], to mention no other at present, that come not within the prefixed term of the life of Athanasius.

It was not above three years after the death of Athanasius that St. Ambrose was made bishop of Milan, anno 374. He was a zealous defender of the Catholic faith against the Arians, in opposition to whom he composed several hymns in Latin to the glory of the Holy Trinity, for the people to sing in the church. Of which he himself gives this account in his tract against Auxentius [21]: 'They accuse me,' says he, 'for deceiving and alluring the people with the poetry of my hymns. And I do not altogether deny the charge. For what can be more powerful and alluring than the confession of the Trinity, which is daily sung by the mouth of all the people? They all zealously strive to make profession of the faith; they all know how to celebrate the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in verse.' These hymns are mentioned also by Prosper in his Chronicon [22] as the first that were sung in the Church in Latin measures. St. Austin [23] frequently speaks of them, and says they were

[19] Orat. 4. Invect. 2. in Julian. (t. 1. p. 118 d.) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ παραπέμπεται πανδήμοις εὐφημίαις τε καὶ πομπαῖς, καὶ τούτοις δὴ τοῖς ἡμετέροις σεμνοῖς, ᾠδαῖς πανν ύχοις καὶ δᾳδουχίαις· αἷς Χριστιανοὶ τιμᾷν μετάστασιν εὐσεβῆ νομίζομεν, καὶ γίνεται πανήγυρις μετὰ πάθους, ἡ ἐκκομιδὴ τοῦ σώματος.

[20] L. 6. c. 30. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 358.) Μηδὲ ἐπιζητεῖτε Ἰουδαϊκοὺς ἀφορισμούς, ἢ συνεχῆ βαπτίσματα, ἢ καθαρισμοὺς ἐπὶ θίξει νεκροῦ· ἀπαρατηρήτως δὲ συναθροίζεσθε ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις, τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων ποιούμενοι, καὶ ψάλλοντες ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων μαρτύρων καὶ πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἁγίων, καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν τῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ κεκοιμημένων.

[21] Ad calc. Ep. 32. [al. 21.] (t. 2. p. 873 b. n. 34.) Hymnorum quoque meorum carminibus deceptum populum ferunt. Plane nec hoc abnuo. Grande carmen istud est, quo nihil potentius. Quid enim potentius quam confessio Trinitatis, quæ quotidie totius populi ore celebratur? Certatim omnes student fidem fateri; Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum norunt versibus prædicare.

[22] Anno 386., ap. Pagi Crit. in Baron. an. 387. n. 7. (t. 1. p. 568.) Hymni Ambrosii compositi, qui nunquam ante in ecclesiis Latinis modulis canebantur.

[23] Confess. l. 9. c. 7. (t. 1. p. 162 f.) Tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus mœroris tædio contabesceret, institutum est; et ex illo in hodiernum retentum, multis jam ac pene omnibus gregibus tuis et per cætera orbis imitantibus.

sung, as then the Psalms were, in the alternate way, verse for verse by the people, to alleviate the tediousness of their sorrow: and from this example the custom of alternate hymnody and psalmody spread almost all over the Western Churches. One of these is particularly cited by him[24] as an evening hymn, and others are among his works: and these we are sure in the following ages continued in use: for the hymns of St. Ambrose and St. Hilary are mentioned by the fourth Council of Toledo[25], anno 633, as parts of the daily service in the Spanish Churches. St. Ambrose himself also speaks of the use of that ancient hymn called the Trisagion[26], telling us 'that in most of the Eastern and Western Churches, when the sacrifice was offered to God, the priest and people with one voice said, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, all the earth is full of thy glory!' He mentions also[27] the common form of salutation, 'The peace of God be with you.' He says[28], 'the music spoken

[24] Ibid. c. 12. (p. 169 a, b.) Recordatus sum veridicos versus Ambrosii:

Deus Creator omnium
Polique rector, vestiens
Diem decoro lumine,
Noctem soporis* gratia;
Artus solutos ut quies
Reddat laboris usui,
Mentesque fessas allevet,
Luctusque solvat anxios.

—Conf. Retractat. l. 1. c. 21. (t. 1. p. 32 b.) .... In quo [libro nempe contra Epistolam Donati] dixi in quodam loco de Apostolo Petro, quod in illo, tanquam in petra, fundata sit ecclesia: qui sensus etiam cantatur ore multorum in versibus beatissimi Ambrosii, ubi de gallo gallinaceo ait:

Hoc ipsa petra ecclesiæ
Canente, culpam diluit.

[25] C. 12. See before, p. 413. n. 67.

[26] De Spiritu Sancto, cited by Comber of Liturgies, (p. 183.) [Locus iste sine dubio est l. 3. c. 16. (t. 2. p. 688 c. n. 110.), qui autem non omnia probat, quæ hic dicit Binghamus. Ita habet: Cherubim et Seraphim indefessis vocibus laudant et dicunt, *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth*.... .. Nos quoque nihil pretiosius invenimus, quo Deum prædicare possimus, nisi ut Sanctum appellemus. .... Seraphim laudant, omnis beatorum chorus laudat, ut Sanctum Deum dicat, Sanctum Filium, Sanctum Spiritum. Quomodo igitur non omnia habet, quæ Dei sunt, qui cum Patre et Filio a sacerdotibus et in baptismate nominatur, et in oblationibus invocatur, cum Patre et Filio? *Grischov.*]

[27] De Dignit. Sacerd. c. 5. (t. 2. append. p. 363 b.) Pronuntiat episcopus hujusmodi ad populum dicens, *Pax vobis, &c.*

[28] L. 7. in Luc. 15, [25 et seqq.] t. 5. p. 125. (t. 1. p. 1468 b. n. 238.) Hæc est enim symphonia, quando concinit in ecclesia diversarum ætatum [al. diversorum actuum] atque virtutum, velut variarum chordarum, indiscreta concordia. Psalmus respondetur: Amen! dicitur. Hæc est symphonia, quam scivit et Paulus; et ideo ait, *Psallam spiritu, psallam et mente.*

* [Al. *sopora.* In ante excusis *soporis.* At in multis MSS. *sopora,* a verbo *soporo;* melius, siquidem hocce hymno somnus quietus ad recreandas corporis et animi vires postulatur. *Ed. Bened. in loc.* Ed.]

of in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, (Luke 15,) means the whole Church's singing together the Psalms alternately, men, women, and children, with different voices, but all conspiring, as the strings of an instrument, in one harmonious concord. And this was the symphony which the Apostle had reference to when he said, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."' His Books *De Sacramentis*, if we allow them to be his, are so full of forms and ceremonies relating to the administration of baptism, confirmation, and the eucharist, that a man cannot look into them but he must conclude he wrote his accounts of these things from the known and settled forms of the Church. For which reason I think it needless to recite any of them; but they that please may see them related in Dr. Comber[29]. If any one should except against these Books as none of St. Ambrose's genuine offspring, it is sufficient to have evidenced the use of forms from his undoubted writings.

St. Jerom testifies concerning the use of the Psalms, as forms of prayer and praises, that they were used both publicly and privately upon all occasions. In the Egyptian monasteries, he says[30], the singing of the Psalms was a principal part of their devotions at every solemn meeting. He directs Rusticus[31] 'to learn the psalter by heart, and to repeat the Psalm in his turn, as the monks were obliged to do one by one in their assemblies.' He says of himself[32] 'that he thus learned the Psalms by heart when he was young, and sung them when he was old every day.' He directs Læta[33], a noble lady, 'so to accustom her daughter to the singing of psalms and hymns at all the canonical hours of prayer, and teach her this by her own example.' And after the same man-

[29] Origin of Liturgies, part 2. ch. 4. (p. 182.) Then reciting the words, &c.

[30] Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. c. 15. See before, p. 408. n. 56. Conf. Ep. 27. c. 10 [al. 108. c. 19.] (t. 1. p. 706 a.) Post virorum monasterium &c.

[31] Ep. 4. [al. 125.] (ibid. p. 933 c.) .... Discatur psalterium ad verbum.—Ibid. (p. 936 d.) .... Dicas psalmum in ordine tuo.

[32] Invect. 2. cont. Ruffin. c. 7. [al. Apol. cont. Ruffin. l. 2. c. 24.] (t. 2. p. 518 c.) Ego ne contra Septuaginta Interpretes aliquid sum locutus, quos ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatos meæ linguæ studiosis dedi, quos quotidie in conventu fratrum edissero, quorum Psalmos jugi meditatione decanto. Jam stultus eram, ut, quod in pueritia didici, senex oblivisci vellem?

[33] Ep. 7. [al. 107.] (t. 1. p. 680 c.) Assuescat exemplo ad orationes et psalmos nocte consurgere, mane hymnos canere, tertia, sexta, nona, &c.

ner he writes to Demetrias[34], a virgin, 'to observe the order of psalmody and prayers at every such stated hour.' There may be some dispute about the observation of canonical hours, seven times a day, in the public service of the Church, but there is none about the use of psalmody in general: for St. Jerom, writing to Sabinianus[35], a deacon, who had been guilty of some indecent behaviour toward a consecrated virgin, reminds him of the immodest signs he had made to her even whilst he stood in the choir of the singers. And a little before[36], he speaks of 'the whole Church sounding forth hymns to Christ their Lord in her nocturnal vigils,' a great part of which, we shall see hereafter, was always spent in psalmody. This was always a part of their funeral service: for speaking of the great concourse of bishops and people at the funeral of the lady Paula[37], he says, 'some of the bishops led up the choir of singers, and the people sounded forth the Psalms in order, some in Greek, some in Latin, some in Syriac, according to the different language of every nation.' He says the same in his Epitaph of Fabiola[38], 'that the people made the gilded roof of the temple shake and echo again with their psalms and hallelujahs.' It is also observable that in St. Jerom's time, and long before, the Church had a peculiar order among her clergy called *singers*, which he himself mentions[39], and of which I have given a more particular account in a former Book[40]. He also frequently speaks[41] of the clergy as 'ministering in a peculiar habit or

[34] Id. Ep. 8. [al. 130.] ad Demetr. (ibid. p. 985 d.) . . . Considerans præter psalmorum et orationis ordinem, quod tibi hora tertia, sexta, nona, ad vesperum, media nocte et mane, semper est exercendum.

[35] Ep. 48. [al. 147.] (ibid. p. 1083 b.) . . . . Stabas deinceps in choro psallentium, et impudicis nutubus loquebaris.

[36] Ibid. (a.) . . . Tota ecclesia nocturnis vigiliis Christum Dominum personabat, &c.

[37] Ep. 27. [al. 108.] (ibid. p. 716 d.) Alii choros psallentium ducerent in media ecclesia. . . Græco, Latino, Syroque sermone psalmi in ordine personabant.

[38] Ep. 30. [al. 77.] (ibid. p. 462 c.) Sonabant psalmi, et aurata tecta templorum reboans in sublime quatiebat alleluia!

[39] In Eph. 5, 19. (t. 7. p. 652 a.) Audiant hæc adolescentuli: audiant hi, quibus psallendi in ecclesia officium est, &c.

[40] B. 3. ch. 7. v. 1. p. 332.

[41] Ep. 3. [al. 60.] ad Heliodor. (t. 1. p. 339 c.) . . . . Hanc tunicam, qua utebar in ministerio Christi, mitte dilectissimo &c.—In Ezek. 44, 17. (t. 5. p. 547 a.) Per quæ discimus, non quotidianis, et quibuslibet pro usu vitæ communis pollutis vestibus, nos ingredi debere in sancta sanctorum, sed munda conscientia et mundis vestibus tenere Domini sacramenta.—Cont. Pelag. l. 2. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 713 d.) Quæ sunt, rogo, inimicitiæ contra Deum, si tunicam

white garment, in imitation of the angels,' of which more will be said hereafter. At present I only observe, that this could not be done without some rule or order prescribing the ceremonies of decency in divine worship. He does not say much of the other parts of the liturgy, yet he frequently mentions[42] the form of renunciation used in baptism, and the use of the Creed, as does also Pelagius, in his Comments upon the Epistles of St. Paul under the name of St. Jerom[43], and Hilary, the Roman deacon, under the name of St. Ambrose[44], whose authorities are good in this case because they were contemporaries with these writers. He mentions also[45] the use of the Lord's Prayer in the communion-office, as 'given by Christ to his Apostles, from whom the Church learned to use it every day in the sacrifice of his body.' He speaks likewise[46] of the Trisagion, or cherubical hymn, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth! which they sung as a confession of the Holy Trinity. And he mentions[47] a part of one of the Church's prayers, which was, 'Lord, grant us thy peace, for thou hast given us all things.' And again[48], 'Thus saith the Church, In rest and in tribulation I have been mindful of thee?' Commenting on

habuero mundiorem? si episcopus, presbyter, et diaconus, et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus in administratione sacrificiorum cum candida veste processerint?—Ep. ad Præsid. Diacon. de Cereo Paschal. (t. 11. p. 156 b.) ... Candenti veste ....

[42] In Am. 6, 14. (t. 6. p. 322 d.) Primum renuntiamus ei, qui occidente est, nobisque moritur cum peccatis; et sic versi ad orientem, pactum inimus cum Sole Justitiæ, et ei servituros nos esse promittimus.—In Matth. 5, 26. (t. 7. p. 28 c.) Renuntio tibi, Diabole, et pompæ tuæ, et vitiis tuis, et mundo tuo, qui in maligno positus est.–Dialog. cont. Lucifer. c. 3. [al. 12.] (t. 2. p. 184 d.) Præterea quum solemne sit in lavacro, post Trinitatis confessionem, interrogare, Credis sanctam ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? &c.

[43] In 1 Tim. 6, 12. (Oper. Hieron. t. 11. p. 154 c.) *Et confessus.* In baptismo, abrenuntiando sæculo et pompis ejus.

[44] In eund. loc. (Oper. Ambr. t. 2. append. p. 303 c.) Fidei enim victoria est, cum omnia vitia et crimina subjugantur, ut ad æternæ vitæ præmia veniatur: cujus confessio inter ipsa rudimenta fidei, teste interrogante et respondente, monimentis ecclesiasticis continetur.

[45] Cont. Pelag. l. 3. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 786 a.) Sicut docuit Apostolos suos, ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui, *Pater noster, qui es in cœlis,* &c.

[46] De 42. Mansionibus [al. Ep. 78. ad Fabiol.] in initio. (t. 1. p. 465 d.) .... In confessionem Sanctæ Trinitatis erumpimus, dicentes, *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus, Deus Sabaoth!*

[47] Ep. 4. [al. 125.] ad Rustic. (t. 1. p. 941 d.) Atque utinam audiatur vox ecclesiæ implorantis, Domine pacem tuam da nobis: omnia enim dedisti nobis.

[48] In Ps. 62. (t. 7. p. 159.) Dicit hæc ecclesiæ, Et in requie et in tribulatione non fui tui oblitus.

that Psalm which the Ancients called their *Morning Psalm*, "My God, my God, early will I seek thee." And on another Psalm[49], 'The Church says, From the remembrance of our former sins, our hearts are hot within us.' Speaking also of wicked priests, he says[50], 'they act impiously against Christ, whilst they think that a good life is not as necessary to the eucharist as the solemn prayer or words of the priest.' Where he seems plainly to reflect on those who trusted to the bare form of prayer without moral qualifications. He also mentions[51] the solemn rite of giving each other the kiss of peace in the eucharist, and the people's known custom of answering Amen! at the reception of it. All which are plain indications of the use of certain forms in divine worship; though St. Jerom only mentions them incidentally, and had no occasion to enlarge much upon them.

St. Austin and St. Chrysostom, as they are more voluminous writers, so they are more copious and exact upon this subject. I have given the reader a specimen of what may be collected of the Eastern liturgy out of the writings of St. Chrysostom in the following chapter. And some learned men are of opinion that if any one will be as curious in examining St. Austin's works, he may find the whole African liturgy in his writings. I will not pretend to be so exact in this collection, but only make some short references to what he says upon some parts of it. He divides the whole liturgy or service of the Church into five parts[52], viz. psalmody, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, prayers of the bishop, and the bidding prayers of the deacon. All which, except preaching, were done by certain forms and prescriptions.

[49] In Ps. 38. (ibid. p. 107.) *Concaluit* [*al. conculcavit*] *cor meum intra me,* dicit ecclesia, *a recordatione delictorum priorum.*

[50] In Zeph. 3. (t. 6. p. 718 c.) Impie agunt in legem Christi, putantes εὐχαριστίαν imprecantis facere verba, non vitam; et necessariam esse tantum solemnem orationem, et non sacerdotum merita.

[51] Ep. 62. [al. 82.] ad Theophil. c. 1. (t. 1. p. 510 b.) Quisquamne inter sacras epulas Judæ osculum porrigit?... Qua conscientia ad eucharistiam Christi accedam, et respondebo Amen! cum de caritate dubitem porrigentis?

[52] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 18. (t. 2. p. 142 c.) Quando autem non est tempus, cum in ecclesia fratres congregantur, sancta cantandi, nisi cum legitur, aut disputatur, aut antistes clara voce deprecatur, aut communis oratio voce diaconi indicitur?

And, first, for psalmody, he says, 'it was the exercise of the people at all times, when no other part of the service was performing. For there was no time,' he says, 'unseasonable for the people to sing holy psalms and hymns in the church, except when either the Scriptures were read, or the sermon was preached, or prayers were made by the bishop, or the common prayers were dictated by the voice of the deacon.' We have heard him before[53] speak with approbation of the ways of singing psalms and hymns, introduced by Athanasius and St. Ambrose[54]. Which argues not only that he allowed the singing of psalms and hymns, that is, forms of prayer and praises, in general; but also, that he liked the several ways of singing then in use, the plain song, and the symphoniacal concert at the conclusion of every verse, used by Athanasius, and the new alternate way introduced by St. Ambrose. Though he intimates[55] that the plain way generally was more agreeable to the slow genius of the African people, whose singing he vindicates from the scurrilous objections which the Donatists made against their practice. And he wrote a book particularly against one Hilarius, a secular tribune, who pretended to quarrel with the custom of the Church of Carthage for singing hymns out of the Book of Psalms at the altar, either before the oblation of the eucharist was made, or whilst it was being distributed to the people. This book of St. Austin's is now lost, but he mentions it in his Retractations[56]. He also speaks of the evening hymns[57], and of the singing of the Halleluia![58] in some Churches every day, and in others only the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost. And Possidius tells us in his

[53] See n. 23, preceding.

[54] See n. 24, preceding.

[55] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Paulin. [corrige, ad Januar.] c. 18. (t. 2. p. 142 b.) Ita ut Donatistæ nos reprehendant, quod sobrie psallimus in ecclesia divina cantica Prophetarum, &c.

[56] L. 2. c. 11. (t. 1. p. 45 f.) .... Hilarius quidam, vir tribunitius, laicus Catholicus, ... morem, qui tunc esse apud Carthaginem cœperat, ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de Psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive cum distribueretur populo quod fuisset oblatum, maledicta reprehensione ubicunque poterat lacerabat, &c.

[57] De Civitat. Dei. l. 22. c. 8. (t. 7. p. 667 c.) Ibi cum jaceret vel morte proximus, vel simillimus mortuo, ad vespertinos illuc hymnos et orationes cum ancillis suis et quibusdam sanctimonialibus intravit.

[58] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 17. (t. 2. p. 141 d.) Ut autem halleluia! per illos solos dies quinquaginta in ecclesia cantetur, non usquequaque observatur. Nam in aliis diebus varie cantatur alibi atque alibi; ipsis autem diebus ubique.

Life[59], 'that, in the great irruption of the Vandals into Afric a little before his death, nothing grieved him more than to see the hymns and praises of God destroyed out of the churches, and the solemnities of God's worship, with the sacrifice and sacraments, to fail in the places, where they were used to be celebrated.' And he adds[60], 'that in his last sickness he ordered some of the penitential Psalms of David to be written for him on large sheets, and hanged up against the wall, which he read and used as forms proper for penitential devotion.' All which shows that St. Austin thought the Psalms of David were not unlawful to be used as forms of prayers and praises in the service of God.

Secondly, for the reading of the Scriptures, he acquaints us in many places that this was done by a certain rule and calendar, appointing proper lessons for particular occasions and seasons. There were some festival days, he says[61], on which they were bound to read certain appropriated lessons out of the Gospel, which were so fixed to those anniversary solemnities, that no other lessons might be read in their room. Thus he says[62] in Easter week they constantly read four days one after

[59] C. 28. (t. 10. append. p. 277 f, et p. 278 a.) Videbat enim ille homo . . ecclesias sacerdotibus ac ministris destitutas, . . . hymnos Dei et laudes de ecclesiis deperiisse, . . . solemnia, quæ Deo debentur, de propriis locis desiisse sacrificia, sacramenta divina vel non quæri, vel quærenti qui tradat non facile reperiri, &c.

[60] Ibid. c. 31. (p. 279 e, f.) . . . Sibi jusserat Psalmos Davidicos, qui sunt paucissimi de pœnitentia, scribi, ipsosque quaterniones jacens in lecto contra parietem positos diebus suæ infirmitatis intuebatur, et legebat, et jugiter ac ubertim flebat, &c.

[61] In 1 Ioan. in Præfat. [sive Prolog.] t. 9. p. 235. (t. 3. part 2. p. 826.) . . . . Interposita est solemnitas sanctorum dierum, quibus certas ex Evangelio lectiones oportet in ecclesia recitari, quæ ita sunt annuæ, ut aliæ esse non possint, &c.

[62] Serm. 139. de Temp. [al. Serm. 240. In Dieb. Paschal. 11.] (t. 5. p. 1001 a.) Per hos dies, . . . solemniter leguntur evangelicæ lectiones, ad resurrectionem Domini pertinentes.—Serm. 140. [al. 235. In Dieb. Paschal. 6.] (p. 989 d.) Hesterno die, id est, nocte, lecta est ex Evangelio resurrectio Salvatoris. Lecta est autem ex Evangelio secundum Matthæum. Hodie vero, sicut audistis pronuntiare lectorem, recitata est nobis Domini resurrectio, sicut Lucas evangelista conscripsit. — Serm. 141. [al. 231. In Dieb. Paschal. 2.] (p. 977 c.) Resurrectio Domini nostri Jesu Christi ex more legitur his diebus ex omnibus libris sancti Evangelii. — Serm. 144. [al. 232. In Dieb. Paschal. 3.] (p. 980 d.) Resurrectio Domini nostri Jesu Christi et hodie recitata est; sed de altero libro Evangelii, qui est secundum Lucam. Primo enim lecta est secundum Matthæum, hesterno autem die secundum Marcum, hodie secundum Lucam.—Serm. 148. [al. 248. In Dieb. Paschal. 19.] (p. 1020 c.) Et hodie lectio recitata est de his, quæ facta sunt post resurrectionem Domini secundum evangelistam Ioannem.

another the history of Christ's resurrection out of the four Gospels, on the first day St. Matthew, on the second St. Mark, on the third St. Luke, and on the fourth St. John. So likewise on the day of Christ's passion, he says[63], they read the history of his sufferings out of St. Matthew only, because it was all but one day; and when he would have had all the four Gospels read at that time also, the people were disturbed at it, because they had not been accustomed to it. In the time between Easter and Pentecost, he says[64], they always read the Acts of the Apostles. St. Chrysostom will give us the reason of this hereafter[65]: and we shall see that this was an universal custom obtaining throughout the whole Church, when we come to consider this rule[66] more fully exemplified in the Church's general practice.

Thirdly, for the prayers made by the bishop in the communion-office, St. Austin gives us such a description of them, as shows they must needs be made by a certain order and form. For he thus describes one part of them, while he instructs the newly-baptized in the method and meaning of them: 'Ye understand,' says he[67], 'the sacrament in the order of its administration. First after prayer, (meaning the prayer for the whole state of the Church, which went before,) ye are taught to lift up your hearts. Therefore when it is said, *Lift up your hearts!* ye answer, *We lift them up unto the Lord!* The bishop or presbyter who officiates goes on and says, *Let us*

[63] Serm. 144. de Temp. p. 320. [al. Serm. 232. ut supra.] (p. 980 e.) Passio autem quia uno die legitur, non solet legi nisi secundum Matthæum, &c.

[64] Tract. 6. in Ioan. Evang. t. 9. p. 24. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 337 g.) Actus Apostolorum testes sunt, ille liber canonicus omni anno in ecclesia recitandus. Anniversaria solemnitate post passionem Domini nostis illum librum recitari.—Conf. Serm. 83. de Divers. [al. Serm 227. In die Pasch. 4.] (t. 5. p. 973 e.) In Actibus Apostolorum advertite, quando legitur. Modo incipit liber ipse legi. Hodie cœpit liber, qui vocatur Actuum Apostolorum.

[65] See the last clauses of the fifth section of the next chapter, p. 461.

[66] B. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. in the next volume.

[67] Serm. 83. de Divers. [al. Serm. 227.] (t. 5. p. 973 g. a. 974 a.) Tenetis sacramenta ordine suo. Primo post orationem admonemini sursum habere cor. .... Ideo cum dicitur, *Sursum cor!* respondetis, *Habemus ad Dominum!* ... Sequitur episcopus vel presbyter, qui offert, et dicit, ... *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro!* .... et vos attestamini, *Dignum et justum est!* dicentes. ... Deinde post sanctificationem sacrificii [Dei] dicimus Orationem Dominicam ... Post istam [al. ipsam] dicitur, *Pax vobiscum:* et osculantur se Christiani [in] osculo sancto.

give thanks unto our Lord God! and ye give in your attestation, and say, *It is meet and right so to do!* Then after the consecration of the sacrifice, we say the Lord's Prayer. And after that, the priest says, *Peace be with you!* and Christians salute one another with an holy kiss.' Here we have not only the method of the communion-service, but the several forms of it in order one after another. And these forms are frequently mentioned by St. Austin in other places. The Lord's Prayer, he says[67], was always used by the whole Church almost at the close of the consecration-service, and at other times, as the daily prayer[68] of the faithful, peculiarly belonging to them and not to the catechumens, as we shall show more fully[69] hereafter. The form *Sursum corda! Lift up your hearts!* he says, was used by all Christians throughout the world, who daily answered with one voice, *We lift up our hearts unto the Lord!* as he speaks in his Book of True Religion[70] and other places. And to this he says the priests added that other form, *Let us give thanks to our Lord God!* to which the people

[67] Ep. 59. [al. 149.] ad Paulin. (t. 2. p. 509 b, c.) Multa quippe hinc dici possunt, quæ improbanda non sint. Sed eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis vel pene omnis frequentat ecclesia, ut *precationes* accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in Domini mensa, incipiat benedici: *orationes*, quum benedicitur et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur, quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia dominica oratione concludit.

[68] Ep. 121. [al. 130.] ad Probam. cc. 11, 12. tot. (t. 2. p. 390.)—Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 71. (t. 6. p. 223 b.) De quotidianis autem brevibus levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana fidelium oratio satisfacit: eorum enim est dicere, *Pater noster, qui es in cœlis, &c.*—Serm. 42. inter 50. [al. Serm. 58.] (t. 5. p. 342 f.) Oratio vobis quotidie dicenda est, cum baptizati fueritis. In ecclesia enim ad altare Dei quotidie dicitur ista oratio dominica, et audiunt illam fideles.

[69] Ch. 7. s. 9. of this Book.

[70] De Ver. Relig. c. 3. (t. 1. p. 750 b, c.) Si denique per urbes atque oppida, castella, vicos et agros etiam, villasque privatas, in tantum aperte persuadetur et appetitur a terrenis aversio, et in unum Deum verumque conversio, ut quotidie per universum orbem humanum genus una pene voce respondeat, *Sursum corda se habere ad Dominum;* quid adhuc oscitamus crapulam hesternam, et in mortuis pecudibus divina eloquia perscrutamur.—Serm. 54. de Temp. [al. Serm. 3. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 10 a.) . . . Et quoties sacerdos dixerit, *Sursum corda!* secure et fideliter dicunt, *Se habere ad Deum*, &c.—Ep. 156. ad Prob. [al. 131.] (t. 2. p. 394 g.) Sed ideo venit Salvator noster, qui mulierem illam in evangelio per decem et octo annos curvam, quæ fortasse hoc significabat, verbo salutis erexit, ut anima Christiana non frustra audiat, *Sursum cor!* nec frustra respondeat, *Se habere ad Dominum.*

answered, *It is meet and right so to do!* as he speaks in his Epistles to Dardanus[71] and Honoratus[72], and in his Books, Of the Gift of Perseverance against the Pelagians[73], and *De Spiritu et Litera*[74], and *De Bono Viduitatis*[75], which, being all to the same purpose, need not here be repeated. He also mentions in his other writings[76] the solemn form of the priest's saying, *Peace be with you!* and the people's giving one another thereupon the kiss of peace, which was a symbol of that innocency and peace which ought to be the qualification of true Christian doves. And this rite, he says[77], was observed not only by the Catholics, but by the Donatists also. So that here is unquestionable evidence for the use of all these forms in the writings of St. Austin. And though he does not give us the whole forms of the longer prayers made by the bishop at the altar, yet he mentions some parts of them, and makes such references and appeals to them, both in his discourses to the orthodox and confutations of heretics, as plainly shows they were common forms which they were well acquainted with, and

[71] Ep. 57. [al. 187. c. 6.] (t. 2. p. 684 g.) Nosti autem, in quo sacrificio dicatur, *Gratias agamus Domino, Deo nostro.*

[72] Ep. 120. [al. De Gratia Novi Testamenti Liber, s. Ep. 140.]—[This citation is not distinct: but the Author seems to have had in mind some closing remark of c. 37. al. n. 85. (t. 2. p. 456 a.) Omnis autem intentio gratiæ Novi Testamenti, qua sursum corda habemus ....id agit ne simus ingrati: atque in ipsa gratiarum actione nihil aliud agitur, nisi ut qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur. Augustine evidently alludes to the liturgical *Sursum Corda!* and *Habemus ad Dominum!* Ed.]

[73] De Bono [al. Dono] Perseverant. c. 13. (t. 10. p. 839 b.) Quod ergo in sacramentis fidelium dicitur, *Ut sursum corda habeamus ad Dominum,* munus est Domini: de quo munere ipsi Domino Deo nostro gratias agere a sacerdote post hanc vocem, quibus hoc dicitur, admonentur, et *Dignum et justum esse* respondent.

[74] De Spirit. et Lit. l. 1. c. 11. (t. 10. p. 94 e.) Unde et in ipso verissimo et in singulari sacrificio Domino Deo nostro agere gratias admonemur.

[75] C. 16. (t. 6. p. 380 a.) Quia et illud, quod inter sacra mysteria *cor habere sursum* jubemur, ipso adjuvante id valemus, quo jubente admonemur: et ideo sequitur, ut de hoc tanto bono sursum levati cordis, non nobis gloriam, quasi nostrarum virium, tribuamus, sed Domino Deo nostro gratias agamus. Hæc enim continuo commonemur, quia hoc dignum est, hoc justum est.

[76] Tract. 6. in Ioan. t. 9. p. 21. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 331 g.) Sic ergo, sic oportebat demonstrari Spiritum Sanctum venientem super Dominum, ut intelligat unusquisque, si habeat Spiritum Sanctum, simplicem se esse debere, sicut columbam: habere cum fratribus veram pacem, quam significant oscula columbarum.

[77] Cont. Lit. Petilian. l. 2. c. 23. (t. 9. p. 233 g.)...Ego illum commemoro, [Optatum Gildonianum] ...cui pacis osculum inter sacramenta copulabatis, &c.

by remembering them might understand the doctrine of the Church. Thus, in his Book of Perseverance[78], he says, 'Those of the Church need not any operose disputations to convince them of the necessity of God's grace to persevere; they need only remember her daily prayers, how she prays that infidels may believe, and that believers may persevere.' And again[79], he tells them, 'It is the safest way for weak men in this dispute to look upon these prayers, which the Church always had, and always will have to the end of the world. For when did not the Church pray for infidels and her enemies, that they might believe? or who ever, when he heard the priest praying over the faithful, and saying, *Grant, O Lord, that they may persevere in thee unto the end*, durst either in word or thought find fault with him, and not rather with faith in his heart, and confession in his mouth, answer *Amen!* to such a benediction? when the faithful pray no otherwise in the Lord's Prayer, especially when they say, *Lead us not into temptation.*' By all which it appears, that both the larger and the shorter prayers, in the communion-office of the African Church in St. Austin's time, were offered up in such forms as the people could easily remember, when he referred to them as evidence in some disputes, which this was an easy way to determine.

Fourthly, there was one sort of prayers more, which St. Austin distinguishes from the former, by the name of *the common prayers*, dictated or indicted to the people by the voice of the deacon. Now these prayers, as I shall show more fully hereafter[80], differed from the bishop's prayer in this, that the bishop's prayer was a direct and continued invocation

[78] C. 7. (t. 10. p. 828 g.) In hac re non operosas disputationes exspectet ecclesia, sed attendat quotidianas orationes suas. Orat... ut credentes perseverent.

[79] Ibid. c. 23. (p. 855 e, f.) Atque utinam tardi corde et infirmi, qui non possunt, vel nondum possunt, Scripturas, vel earum expositiones intelligere, sic audirent, vel non audirent in hac quæstione disputationes nostras, ut magis intuerentur orationes suas, quas semper habuit et habebit ecclesia ab exordiis suis, donec finiatur hoc sæculum..... Quando enim non oratum est in ecclesia pro infidelibus atque inimicis ejus, ut crederent?.... Aut quis sacerdotem super fideles Dominum invocantem, si quando dixit, *Da illis, Domine, in te perseverare usque in finem*, non solum voce ausus est, sed saltem cogitatione reprehendere, ac non potius super ejus talem benedictionem, et corde credente et ore confitente respondit, *Amen!* cum aliud in ipsa oratione dominica non orant fideles, dicentes maxime illud, *Ne nos inferas in tentationem*, nisi ut in sancta obedientia perseverent?

[80] B. 15. ch. 1. s. 2. next vol.

of God, to which the people answered only, Amen! in the conclusion; but the deacon's prayer was a sort of bidding prayer, or direction to the people what particulars they were to pray for; the deacon going before them, and repeating every petition, to which they made answer, Lord hear us! or, Lord help us! or, Lord have mercy! or the like. And this sort of prayer St. Austin expressly calls [81] *communis oratio voce diaconi indicta, common prayer dictated by the voice of the deacon.* And he seems in one of his Epistles [82] to specify some of the particular petitions contained in that prayer. For writing to one, who was infected with the Pelagian doctrine, maintaining that infidels were only to be preached to, and not prayed for, because faith was not the work of God's grace, but the effect of man's own free-will, he urges him with the known prayers of the Church, which the man himself frequented. 'Exercise,' says he, 'your disputations against the prayers of the Church, and when you hear the priest of God at the altar exhorting the people of God to pray for unbelievers, that they may be converted to the faith; and for catechumens, that God would inspire them with a desire of regeneration; and for the faithful, that by his gift they may persevere in that wherein they have begun; mock at these pious words, and say, you do not do what you here are exhorted to do.' And again [83], 'When you hear the priest of God at the altar exhorting the people to pray to God, or else hear him praying with an audible voice, that God would compel the unbelieving Gentiles to come in to his faith, do you not answer and say, Amen?' These seem to be usual parts of the prayer for the whole state of the world, in which infidels were prayed for as well as others, to which

[81] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 18. (t. 2. p. 142 b, c.) Quando autem non est tempus, quum in ecclesia fratres congregantur, sancta cantandi, nisi quum legitur, aut disputatur, aut antistes clara voce deprecatur, aut communis oratio voce diaconi indicitur?

[82] Ep. 107. [al. 217.] ad Vital. p. 187. (t. 2. p. 799 f.) Exsere [al. Exerce] contra orationes ecclesiæ disputationes tuas, et quando audis sacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem populum Dei, orare pro incredulis, ut eos Deus convertat ad fidem; et pro catechumenis, ut eis desiderium regenerationis inspiret; et pro fidelibus, ut in eo, quod esse cœperunt, ejus munere perseverent; subsanna pias voces, et dic, te non facere, quod hortatur, &c.

[83] Ep. 107. [al. 217.] ad Vital. p. 191. (t. 2. p. 808 a.) Numquid ubi audieris sacerdotem Dei ad ejus altare populum hortantem ad Deum orandum, vel ipsum clara voce orantem, ut incredulas gentes ad fidem suam venire compellat, non respondebis Amen?

St. Austin refers, as things well known to all that frequented the prayers of the Church.

Besides these, there were some occasional offices, such as the office of exorcism, and the institution of the catechumens, and baptism, in which many forms, and rites, and ceremonies were observed, agreeable to the practice then obtaining in the Church: but of these I have had occasion to speak largely out of St. Austin and other writers in a former Book [84], and therefore think it needless to repeat them in this place. All I shall further add is two or three canons of the African Councils, held in St. Austin's time, at some of which he was present and assisted. He was a member of the third Council of Carthage, in one of whose canons [85] there are several orders and directions given concerning the public prayers, 'that no one in prayers should name the Father for the Son, or the Son for the Father.' 'And when they stood at the altar, all prayers should be directed to the Father.' And 'whatever prayers any one wrote out for himself, or from other books, he should not use them before they were examined by his more learned brethren.' This is as plain an argument for set forms as can be given, and yet some, I know not by what means, make it an argument against them. The design of the canon was plainly to prevent all irregularities and corruptions creeping into the devotions of the Church: and therefore the fathers made an order, that no bishop should use any prayers in his church, but such as were first examined and approved by his fellow-bishops in a council: as another canon in the African Code [86] explains it, 'that such prayers should be used by all, as had been authorized and confirmed in synod, whether they were prefaces, or commendations, or impositions of hands; and that no other should be brought in against the faith, but those only be said, which were collected or examined by men of greater abilities and understanding.' And this is repeated again in

[84] Books ix. and x.

[85] C. 23. (t. 2. p. 1170d.) Ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filio, vel Filium pro Patre nominet. Et cum ad altare assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio. Et quicunque sibi preces aliunde describit, [al. quascunque sibi preces aliquis describit,] non eis utatur, priusquam eas cum instructioribus fratribus contulerit.

[86] C. 106. [103.] (ibid. p. 1118 e.) ....Ὥστε τὰς κεκυρώμενας ἱκεσίας, εἴτε οἴμια, εἴτε παραθέσεις εἴτε τὰς τῆς χειρὸς ἐπιθέσεις ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. καὶ παντελῶς ἄλλας κατὰ τῆς πίστεως μηδέποτε προσενεχθῆναι, ἀλλ' αἵτινες δήποτε ἀπὸ τῶν συνετωτέρων συνήχθησαν, λεχθήσονται.

the Council of Milevis[87] almost in the same words. These African fathers probably had observed, that there were some country-bishops who had not sufficient abilities to compose orthodox forms for the use of their own churches: and therefore they had a little restrained the ancient liberty, which every bishop had of composing a form of prayer for his own church, and obliged them to use such as were composed by men of greater abilities, or such as had been approved in synod, that no heretical opinion might creep into the public worship, either by their ignorance or want of care in their compositions. By all this it appears, that the public devotions of the African Church were at this time directed by certain forms of worship, and those not left to every bishop to compose for himself, but he must use such prayers as were first approved by his brethren, or established and confirmed in council. And this seems to be the first beginning of that custom, which afterward prevailed all over the Church, as has been before observed in this chapter[88], that all provincial bishops should use the same form of prayer that was established in the churches of their metropolitans.

I need not now insist upon these same Councils speaking of the solemn interrogatories and answers to be made in baptism[89]; nor of their mentioning the Lord's Prayer, as a form of so necessary and general a use[90], that the Pelagians themselves, who did not like one petition in it unless interpreted to a very perverse sense, durst not presume to lay aside the use of it. For as the first of these is a known practice, so the second will have a more particular handling, when we come to consider the use of the Lord's Prayer in a chapter[91] by itself. And so I

[87] C. 12. (ibid. 1540 e.) Placuit etiam et illud, ut preces vel orationes seu missæ, quæ probatæ fuerint in synodo [al. consilio], sive præfationes, sive commendationes, sive manus impositiones, ab omnibus celebrentur. Nec aliæ omnino dicantur, nisi quæ a prudentioribus tractatæ, vel comprobatæ in synodo fuerint, ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum.

[88] See before, s. 2, of this chapt.

[89] Vid. Carth. 3. c. 34. (ibid. 1172 d.) Ut ægrotantes, si per se respondere non possunt, cum voluntatis eorum testimonium hi, qui sui sunt, periculo proprio dixerint, baptizentur.

[90] Vid. C. Milev. c. 8. (ibid. p. 1540 b.) Item placuit, ut quicunque verba ipsa Dominicæ orationis, ubi dicimus, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ita volunt a sanctis dici, ut humiliter non veraciter hoc dicatur, anathema sit.

[91] The seventh of this Book.

put an end to this chapter concerning the use of liturgies in the ancient Church.

CHAP. VI.

An extract of the ancient liturgy out of the genuine writings of St. Chrysostom.

Parts of the liturgy in the first tome.

1. It has often been wished by learned men, that some one would represent the ancient liturgy in its several parts and offices, as it may be collected out of the genuine and undoubted writings of St. Chrysostom; forasmuch as that Liturgy, which goes under his name, cannot be so certainly depended on as his genuine offspring: but there are a great many parts of ancient liturgy of unquestionable credit, which may be gathered up out of his other discourses. Mr. Hales[1] of Eton, a diligent reader of St. Chrysostom, is said to have designed such a collection, but he did not effect it. Therefore till some one else pursues his design more completely, I think it not improper, for its relation to the present subject, to give the reader in one view a specimen of such passages as plainly refer to the several parts of the ancient liturgy, observing the order of St. Chrysostom's works[2] according to the Paris edition 1609, and that of Commelin 1617, [or the Frankfort edition of 1697–8.]

[1] [Mr. John Hales, M.A., called *the ever memorable.* Born at Bath, 1584: entered at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1597: admitted fellow of Merton 1606, and of Eton 1613. He attended the Synod of Dort in 1618, when he became a convert to Arminianism. He was made canon of Windsor in 1639, and was afterwards ejected in the Great Rebellion. Died 1656. See Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, Lond. 1853—54, which also gives a full abstract of his works. Ed.]

[2] [It is remarkable that these dates do not exactly agree with the statement in the *Index Auctorum*, where the dates of the edition employed are given thus,—Paris 1616 et apud Commelin. 1617.—See my note on the place, where I endeavour to explain some of the difficulties relative to the early editions of Chrysostom's Works.

The discrepancy I can only account for by supposing that, when my learned Ancestor was finally writing up and printing this thirteenth Book of his great Work, while resident at Havant, in 1719, he had not precisely the same edition at hand, as he had when framing his Catalogue of Authorities, first published at the end of his tenth volume, in 1722. I believe, too, that the Parisian edition of 1609, (See Walchii Biblioth. Patrist. c. 2. s. 16. p. 134.) consisted only of the first six volumes; to which the other four were afterwards added *e Bibliopolio Commeliniano*, between that date and 1624. Thus some sets were composed of six volumes printed in 1609 with four dated later; while other sets, corresponding in pagination, consisted of the ten volumes either at once printed, or completed, in 1616—1617. I have seen a set of

In the first tome, Homily first[3], p. 1, [1,] he plainly intimates, that the Scriptures were read then in some order by a stated rule of the Church, because his sermon that day was upon a passage that had been read in the course of morning service, (1 Tim. 5, 23.) "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine, &c." In his second Homily[4], p. 32, [27,] he says again his text was taken out of the Epistle then read for the day, which was, (1 Tim. 6, 17.) "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded." In his third Homily[5], p. 45, he says, the Lord's Prayer was by appointment of the Church the peculiar privilege of those only, who were baptized; for before their initiation in the holy mysteries, they were not allowed to use it. In his seventh Homily[6], p. 106, [94,] he observes, that the Book of Genesis was always appointed to be read in Lent: and accordingly it was then read for the day, and he preached upon the first words of it, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." In his fifteenth Homily[7], p. 191, [170,]

the Editio Ducæana made up of six and four volumes of the respective dates, and another, at Sion College Library, the first five volumes of which are dated Paris 1621, the sixth 1624, the seventh 1617, and the three last 1603.

For nearly all the following citations *in extenso* throughout this chapter we are indebted to Grischovius, who first gave the references in full, with the exception of my own additions. He consulted the Frankfort reprint, 1697–8, of Claude Morell's complete edition of 1636 at Paris. I have verified from the Benedictine, collated with the edition of Savil: and, under the peculiar circumstances of this important chapter, I have deemed it imperative to afford junior students the advantage of double references, which I have distinguished by their respective initials, B. and S. Ed.]

[3] Hom. 1. (B. t. 2. p. 6. S. t. 6. p. 448. 1.) Ἠκούσατε τοίνυν σήμερον περὶ πολλῶν καὶ ἀναγκαίων πραγμάτων διαλεγομένου τῷ Τιμοθέῳ. Καὶ γὰρ περὶ χειροτονιῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπέστελλεν, εἰπὼν, Χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, κ. τ. λ. Εἶτα πάλιν φησὶν, Οἴνῳ ὀλίγῳ χρῶ, κ. τ. λ. Καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν οἰκετῶν ὑποταγῆς, καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν φιλαργύρων μανίας, καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν πλουτούντων ἀπονοίας, καὶ περὶ πολλῶν ἡμῖν ἑτέρων διελέχθη τήμερον.

[4] Hom. 2. (B. p. 25 e. S. p. 465. 40.) Ἡμῖν δὲ ὥρα λοιπὸν τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου παραθεῖναι τράπεζαν, τὴν σήμερον ἀναγνωσθεῖσαν ῥῆσιν προχειρισαμένους καὶ εἰς μέσον καταθεμένους ἅπασι. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστι τὸ σήμερον ἀναγνωσθέν; Τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι παράγγελλε μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν.

[5] Hom. 3. (B. p. 36 c. S. p. 473. 35.) Προσθήσει τοῖς εἰρημένοις καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐκείνην, ἣν οἱ μυσταγωγήσαντες αὐτὸν τὴν ἱερὰν μυσταγωγίαν ἐπαίδευσαν εὔχεσθαι, καὶ λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἡμῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[6] Hom. 7. (B. p. 85 e. S. p. 511. 2.)...Τὸ σήμερον ἡμῖν ἀναγνωσθὲν μεταχειριοῦμαι [Sav. μεταχειριούμεθα] βιβλίον. καὶ εἰ δοκεῖ, τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ προοίμιον, ὃ δοκεῖ μάλιστα μηδὲ ἴχνος ἐμφαίνειν παραμυθίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθόλου παρακλητικῶν ἀλλοτριοῦσθαι λόγων, εἰς μέσον προθεὶς, ὅ, λέγω, ποιήσω φανερόν. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστι τὸ προοίμιον; Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, κ. τ. λ.

[7] Hom. 15. (B. p. 153 a. S. p.

he says, the whole city met together, and *with one common voice*, *τῇ μιᾷ κοινῇ φωνῇ*, made their litany or supplications to God. And in the same discourse[8] he intimates, that a portion of the Prophet Zechariah, (ch. 5.) concerning the flying roll against swearers, had then been read for the day, which he accommodated to the subject of vain oaths, against which he was then discoursing. In his eighteenth Homily[9], p. 226, [202,] he says, he preached upon the Epistle, which had been read that day, (Phil. 4, 4.) "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice." And in his sixteenth Homily[10], p. 234, [282,] he notes the same, that the words upon which he preached out of the Epistle to Philemon, "Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ, &c." had been read that day.

In his twenty-first Homily[11], p. 266, [235,] he takes notice of the use of the hymn called the Trisagion, or Cherubical Hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! in the celebration of the eucharist; arguing to his hearers in this manner upon it: 'What an absurdity is it for a man, after he has heard that mystical song, that was brought down from heaven, brought down, I say, by the cherubims, to pollute his ears with the songs of harlots and the effeminate music of the theatre?' In the same Homily[12] he twice takes notice of the form of renouncing the Devil in baptism, p. 267, [238,] 'We are commanded to say, *Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, I renounce thee, O Satan*, that we may never more return to him.' And again[13], p. 273, [242,] 'Remember,' says he, 'those words, which you spake when you were initiated in the

561. 16.) ... *Ἐκκλησία γέγονεν ἡ πόλις ἅπασα, τῶν ἐργαστηρίων ἀποκεκλεισμένων, καὶ πάντων ἐν ταῖς πανδήμοις ταύταις διημερευόντων λιταῖς, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῇ μιᾷ [καὶ] κοινῇ φωνῇ μετὰ πολλῆς καλούντων τῆς προθυμίας.*

[8] Ibid. (B. p. 158 b. S. p. 565. 14.) *Ἠκούσατε τοῦ Προφήτου σήμερον περὶ τῶν ὅρκων ἡμῖν διαλεγομένου; Ἐπέβλεψα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου, κ. τ. λ.*

[9] Hom. 18. (B. p. 181 a. S. p. 582. 20.) *Ἠκούσατε τοῦ Παύλου σήμερον παραινοῦντος ἡμῖν, καὶ λέγοντος, Χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

[10] Hom. 16. (B. p. 163 c. S. p. 569. 8.) *Φέρε δὲ μίαν ῥῆσιν ἐκ τῶν σήμερον ἀναγνωσθέντων παραθέντες ὑμῖν καταπαύσωμεν τὸν λόγον, Παῦλος δέσμιος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

[11] Hom. 21. (B. Cateches. 1. p. 237 b. S. p. 606. 5.) *Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον, μετὰ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην φωνὴν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν φερομένην, τὴν ἐκ χερουβὶμ λέγω, πορνικοῖς ἄσμασι, καὶ κατακεκλασμένοις μέλεσι, τὴν ἀκοὴν μολύνειν;*

[12] Hom. 21. (B. p. 238 a. S. p. 606. 30.) *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ κελευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, ἵνα μηκέτι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπανέλθωμεν.*

[13] Ibid. (B. p. 242 c. S. p. 609. 41.) *Ἂν ἀναμνησθῇς τῆς φωνῆς ἐκείνης, ἣν ἀφῆκας μυσταγωγουμένη, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι, Σατανᾶ, καὶ τῇ πομπῇ σου, καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου.*

holy mysteries, I renounce thee, O Satan, and thy pomp, and thy worship, and service.' In his twenty-second Homily upon Anger and forgiving Enemies, he argues for the necessity of pardoning offences from the necessary obligation that is laid upon all men to say the Lord's Prayer. 'For this reason,' says he[14], p. 287, [256,] 'we are commanded to say, *Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.*' And again[15], p. 288, [257,] 'When you say, *Forgive us, as we forgive,* if you do not forgive, you ask nothing else of God, but that he would deprive you of all excuse and pardon.' And whereas some pleaded, that they did not say the whole prayer, but omitted that clause, *As we forgive them that trespass against us,* he rebukes them for it[16], and 'bids them not be so vainly cautious, as to think they were excused by curtailing the prayer, but advises them to use the whole prayer, as Christ appointed it to be used, that the necessity of this petition might daily terrify them from revenge, and compel them to grant pardon to their neighbours.' In his twenty-fourth Homily of the Baptism of Christ[17], p. 317, [281,] he again speaks of the Cherubical Hymn in the communion-service. 'Do you think,' says he, 'that you have any secular business at that hour? Do you then imagine yourself to be upon earth, or conversing among men? Whose heart is so stony, as to think, that at that time he stands upon the earth, and is not rather in a choir of angels, with whom you sing that mystical hymn, with whom you send up that triumphal song to God?'

In his twenty-eighth Homily[18], which is the third of the Incomprehensible Nature of God, p. 363, [321,] he speaks of 'the

[14] Hom. 22. (B. Ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 20. p. 207 e. lin. ult. S. Περὶ Μνησικακίας καὶ Ὀργῆς, p. 618. 7.) Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκελεύσθημεν λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.

[15] [Ibid. (B. p. 209 a. S. p. 618. 42.) Ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃς, ἄφες ἡμῖν, ὡς καὶ' ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν, εἶτα σὺ μὴ ἀφῇς, οὐδὲν ἕτερον τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλεῖς, ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀπολογίας ἀποστερεῖν σε καὶ συγγνώμης. Ed.]

[16] Ibid. (B. p. 209 b. S. p. 619. 3.) Μὴ τοίνυν εὐλάβειαν εἶναι νομίσῃς, τὸ μὴ λέγειν ὁλόκληρον τὴν ῥῆσιν, μηδὲ ἐξ ἡμισείας ποιοῦ τὴν εὐχὴν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἔταξεν, οὕτως εὔχου, ἵνα κἂν ἡ ἀνάγκη τῆς λέξεως, φοβοῦσα καθ' ἡμέραν, συνωθήσῃ σε πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πλησίον συγχώρησιν.

[17] Hom. 24. (B. p. 374 b. S. t. 5. p. 528. 12.) Ὅλως γὰρ οἶδας ὅτι πράγματα ἔχεις κατὰ τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην; μέμνησαι γὰρ ὅλως, ὅτι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἶ; νομίζεις δὲ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων εἶναι; καὶ πῶς οὐχὶ λιθίνης ταῦτα διανοίας, τὸ νομίζειν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἐπὶ γῆς ἑστάναι, ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ ἀγγέλων χορεύειν, μεθ' ὧν τὸ μυστικὸν ἐκεῖνο μέλος ἀνέπεμψας, μεθ' ὧν τὴν ἐπινίκιον ἐκείνην ἀνένεγκας ᾠδὴν τῷ Θεῷ.

[18] Hom. 28. See the next note.

common prayer, as sent up with one common voice of the whole congregation speaking and crying aloud to God with one accord.' Some would have excused themselves from these prayers of the Church, by this frivolous plea, 'that they could pray at home, but they could not hear a sermon or discourse of instruction in their own houses; and therefore they would come to sermon but not to prayers.' To whom he makes this reply[19]: 'You deceive yourself, O man: for though you may pray at home, yet you cannot pray there in that manner as you do in the church, where there are so many fathers together, and where the cry of your prayers is sent up to God with one consent. You are not heard so well, when you pray to God by yourself alone, as when you pray with your brethren. For there is something more here, consent of mind, and consent of voice, and the bond of charity, and the prayers of the priests together. For the priests for this very reason preside in the church, that the people's prayers, which are weaker of themselves, laying hold of those that are stronger, may together with them mount up to heaven.' This is a plain description of such common prayers, wherein both priests and people joined not only in heart, but in one common form of words, whereby they cried aloud to God together. A little after[20], p. 365, [323,] he describes these prayers again by the people's *sending up their tremendous cry all at once,—βοῶσι τὴν φρικοδεστάτην βοήν.* And he makes this difference between the manner of the energumens supplicating God, and that of the people, that the one spake not a word, but only supplicated by the posture of their bodies, bowing down their heads, whilst the people, who were allowed to speak audibly in prayers, spake aloud for those who could not speak for themselves. 'For this reason,' says he[21], 'the deacon at the time of the oblation brings forth

[19] Ibid. (B. p. 469 c. S. t. 6. p. 407. 42.) Ἀπατᾷς σαυτὸν [Sav. σεαυτὸν], ἄνθρωπε· εὔξασθαι μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας δυνατόν· οὕτω δὲ εὔξασθαι, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀδύνατον, ὅπου πατέρων πλῆθος τοσοῦτον, ὅπου βοὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀναπέμπεται· οὐχ οὕτως ἀκούῃ μετὰ σαυτὸν τὸν Δεσπότην παρακαλῶν, ὡς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν σῶν· ἐνταῦθα γάρ ἐστι τι πλέον, οἷον ἡ ὁμόνοια, καὶ συμφωνία, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ὁ σύνδεσμος, καὶ αἱ τῶν ἱερέων εὐχαί. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο οἱ ἱερεῖς προεστήκασιν, ἵνα αἱ τοῦ πλήθους εὐχαὶ ἀσθενέστεραι οὖσαι, τῶν δυνατωτέρων τούτων ἐπιλαβόμεναι ὁμοῦ συνανέλθωσιν αὐταῖς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

[20] Ibid. (B. p. 470 c. S. p. 408. 39.) Οὐκ ἄνθρωποι μόνοι βοῶσι τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ἐκείνην βοήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγγελοι προσπίπτουσι τῷ Δεσπότῃ, κ. τ. λ.

[21] Ibid. (B. ibid. e. S. p. 409. 4.)

the energumens, or those that are possessed with evil spirits, and bids them bow their heads only, and signify their supplications by this bodily gesture: for they are not permitted to pray with the common assembly of the brethren: therefore he presents them before the congregation, that you, pitying both their vexation and their disability to speak for themselves, might by the freedom and liberty of speech which is allowed you, grant them your patronage and assistance.' From this it appears, that these prayers for the energumens were in a certain form, in which all the people vocally joined together.

In his twenty-ninth Homily[24], which is the fourth *De Incomprehensibili*, p. 374, [332,] he repeats the same account of the deacon's calling forth the energumens, and bidding them 'bow their heads, and the people's praying to God *ὁμοθυμαδὸν καὶ μετὰ σφοδρᾶς βοῆς, with one consent and with strong cries,* that he would show mercy on them.' A little after in the same Homily[25], p. 375, [333,] he mentions another form used by the deacon, as the herald of the church, who was appointed to call upon the people every now and then, and excite them to fervency in devotion, by using this form of words, *Ὀρθοὶ στῶμεν καλῶς,—Let us elevate our minds, and attend with decency to our devotions.* For, as he there explains it,

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοὺς ἐνεργουμένους κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἵστησι τὸν καιρὸν ὁ διάκονος, καὶ κελεύει κλῖναι τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνον, καὶ τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἱκετηρίας· εὔχεσθαι γὰρ αὐτοὺς μετὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ συλλόγου τῶν ἀδελφῶν οὐ θέμις· διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς ἵστησιν, ἵνα κατελεήσας αὐτοὺς, καὶ τῆς συμφορᾶς, καὶ τῆς ἀφωνίας, τῇ οἰκείᾳ παρρησίᾳ πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων ἀποχρήσῃ προστασίαν.

[24] Hom. 29. (B. p. 477 b. S. p. 413. 40.) *Ἔσται δὲ ἡ χάρις, ἂν διδάξωμεν ὑμᾶς, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἐκείνη γίνεται πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἡ εὐχὴ, καὶ τί δήποτε τοὺς δαιμονῶντας, καὶ τῇ μανίᾳ πονηρᾷ κατεχομένους, εἰσάγεσθαι κελεύει τότε ὁ διάκονος καὶ κλίνειν τὰς κεφαλάς· .... ἵνα, τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἁπάσης ἔνδον παρούσης, κοιναὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ἱκετηρίαι γένωνται, πάντων ὁμοθυμαδὸν τὸν κοινὸν Δεσπότην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐξαιτουμένων, καὶ ἐλεῆσαι παρακαλούντων μετὰ σφοδρᾶς τῆς βοῆς.*

[25] Ibid. (B. p. 478. 6. S. p. 414. 36.) *Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, [τὸ] παρακελεύεσθαι τὸν διάκονον ἅπασι καὶ λέγειν, Ὀρθοὶ στῶμεν καλῶς, οὐχ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ εἰκῇ νενομοθέτηται· ἀλλ' ἵνα τοὺς χαμαὶ συρομένους λογισμοὺς ἀνορθώσωμεν, ἵνα τὴν ἔκλυσιν τὴν ἐκ τῶν βιωτικῶν ἡμῖν γινομένην πραγμάτων ἐκβαλόντες, ὀρθὴν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ παραστῆσαι δυνηθῶμεν ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχήν. .... Μηδεὶς τοίνυν διαλελυμένος τὴν προθυμίαν τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνείτω καὶ μυστικῶν ὕμνων ἐκείνων· μηδεὶς βιωτικοὺς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἐχέτω λογισμοὺς, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ γήϊνα τῆς διανοίας ἐξορίσας, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὅλον ἑαυτὸν μεταθεὶς, ὡς αὐτοῦ πλησίον ἑστὼς τοῦ θρόνου τῆς δόξης, καὶ μετὰ τῶν Σεραφὶμ ἱπτάμενος, οὕτω τὸν πανάγιον ὕμνον ἀναφερέτω τῷ τῆς δόξης καὶ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης Θεῷ.*

this admonition did not so much respect the body, as the mind. 'When the deacon,' says he, 'calls upon us, and says, *Let us stand elevated with decency!* it was not without good reason, that this admonition was by the rule of the Church appointed, but that we should elevate our thoughts that lie grovelling upon the ground; that, casting away the distraction that arises from secular affairs, we should be able to present our souls upright and raised to a spiritual sense in the presence of God. Let no man therefore,' adds he, 'join in those sacred and mystical hymns with remissness of mind; let no man entertain the thoughts of this life at that time; but, driving away all earthly concerns, let him translate himself wholly into heaven, as standing then close by the throne of glory, and flying with the Seraphims: and so let him offer up *τὸν πανάγιον ὕμνον, that most holy hymn,* (meaning the Trisagion, or else the hymn called, Glory be to God on high!) to the God of majesty and glory. It is upon this account we are called upon at this time *ἑστάναι καλῶς, to compose ourselves decently,* as it becomes men who stand in the presence of God, with fear and trembling, with a vigilant and elevated soul.' In his thirty-fourth Homily[26], which is the first against the Jews, p. 440, [389,] he speaks of another form used by the deacon, and that frequently, before the participation of the holy mysteries: he then cried out, *Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους, Discern and know one another!* which was an admonition to the people, that they should suffer no Jew, infidel, heretic, catechumen, or penitent, to communicate among them. In his fortieth Homily[27] upon the martyrs, Juventinus and Maximus, p. 550, [485,] he says, 'The Church kept her vigils all the night with continual psalmody, which was nothing but forms of prayers and praises out of the Holy Scriptures.'

In the forty-seventh Homily[28] upon Julian the martyr, p. 613, [541,] he again mentions the solemn form of renunciation

[26] [Hom. 34. (B. p. 593. b. S. p. 371. 21.) *Οὐκ ὁρᾶτε ἐπὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τί βοᾷ συνεχῶς ὁ διάκονοι; Ἐπιγινώσκετε ἀλλήλους, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[27] Hom. 40. (B. t. 2. p. 581 c. S. t. 5. p. 535. 5.) *Συντρεχόντων πολλῶν, ψαλμῳδίας συνεχεῖς ἐτελοῦντο παννυχίδες ἱεραί.*

[28] Hom. 47. (B. p. 679 a. S. p. 626. 29.) *Σὺ δὲ ἀπετάξω πάσῃ ταύτῃ τῇ πομπῇ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λατρείᾳ συνετάξω, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην, καθ' ἣν τῶν ἱερῶν κατηξιώθης μυστηρίων. Ἀναμνήσθητι τοίνυν τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων καὶ τῆς συνθήκης, καὶ φύγε τὴν παράβασιν.*

in baptism. 'You renounced,' says he, 'all this kind of pomp, (harlots' songs and obscene words used in the theatre,) and made a covenant with Christ, in that day when you were initiated in the holy mysteries. Remember, therefore, those words, and your covenant, and beware you do not transgress it.' In his fifty-first Homily[29] upon Bernice, p. 635, [561,] he says, they used hymns and prayers and psalms at the funerals of Christians; and particularly the words of the 116th Psalm, (v. 7.) "Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee!" implying, that the death of a Christian was a kindness and a rest: for he that is entered into that rest hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. In his fifty-fifth Homily[30], which is the fifth o Repentance, p. 672, [593,] he plainly intimates, that his discourse was made upon the Epistle that had been read for the day: (2 Cor. 12, 21.) "Lest when I come again, I shall bewail many, who have sinned, and have not repented."

In his sixtieth Homily[31], which is his Catechetical Instruction to those that were preparing for Baptism, he takes notice of several forms and rules made by the Church, relating to that matter, p. 797, [705,] as, first, the solemn words by which every man entered into covenant with Christ. For speaking of the danger and ill consequences of deferring baptism to a sick bed, he says, 'When he that is baptized knows none

[29] Hom. 51. (B. p. 638 e. S. p. 476. 38.) *Διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς κοπετοί τινες ἐγίγνοντο καὶ θρῆνοι· νῦν δὲ ψαλμοὶ καὶ ὑμνῳδίαι. Ἔκλαυσαν γοῦν τὸν Ἰακὼβ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας· ἔκλαυσαν καὶ τὸν Μωυσῆν ἑτέρας τοσαύτας οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἐκόψαντο· ἐπειδὴ θάνατος τότε ὁ θάνατος ἦν· νυνὶ δὲ οὐχ οὕτως· ἀλλὰ ὑμνῳδίαι, καὶ εὐχαὶ, καὶ ψαλμοί· δηλούντων ἁπάντων, ὅτι ἡδονὴν ἔχει τὸ πρᾶγμα· οἱ γὰρ ψαλμοὶ εὐθυμίας σύμβολον. Εὐθυμεῖ γάρ τις, φησὶν, ἐν ὑμῖν; ψαλλέτω. Ἐπεὶ οὖν εὐθυμίας ἐσμὲν πεπληρωμένοι, διὰ τοῦτο ψάλλομεν ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς ψαλμοὺς, θαρρεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς τελευτῆς παρακελευομένους. Ἐπίστρεψον γάρ, φησι, ψυχή μου, εἰς τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν σου . . . . . ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσις ἐκείνην, κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ Θεός.*

[30] Hom. 55. (B. p. 326 d. S. Hom. de Pœnitent. 2. t. 6. p. 769. 11.) *Ἠκούσατε τοίνυν, ἵνα ἐκ μέρους ἅψωμαι τῶν ἐφημένων, ὡς ἀρτίως διαλεγόμενος τοῖς Κορινθίοις ἔλεγεν ὁ γενναῖος ἐκεῖνος καὶ θαυμάσιος ἀνὴρ, Μήπως ἐλθὼν, κ. τ. λ.*

[31] Hom. 60. (B. Catech. 1. p. 227 c. S. p. 852. 38.) *Ὅταν γὰρ μήτε τοὺς παρόντας ἐπιγινώσκῃ, μήτε φωνῆς ἀκούῃ, μήτε ἀποκρίνασθαι δύνηται τὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα, δι' ὧν τὴν μακαρίαν συνθήκην πρὸς τὸν κοινὸν ἡμῶν ἁπάντων καταθήσεται Δεσπότην· ἀλλ', ὥσπερ ξύλον ἀργὸν ἢ λίθος, ὁ φωτίζεσθαι μέλλων πρόκειται, νεκροῦ μηδὲν διαφέρων· τί τῆς μυσταγωγίας ὄφελος ἐν ἀναισθησίᾳ τοσαύτῃ;*

that are about him, when he cannot hear a word that is spoken, when he cannot utter those words wherewith he should make the blessed covenant with our common Lord, but lies like a stock or a stone, differing nothing from a dead man; what advantage is it to such an one to be initiated in the holy mysteries in such a state of insensibility?' This implies, that the party baptized was to make his compact with God in a solemn and usual form of words, which a man at the point of death was not able to utter. After this he goes on to show[32], that the Church had appointed the time of Lent chiefly above other times for exorcism and baptism; and that the catechumens, after they were instructed, were remitted over to the exorcists, to have their exorcisms or prayers said over them; and that during this time they were obliged to walk discalceate, and wear only one coat: which were appointments of the Church, he says, established for good reasons, and not without their mystical signification. In his seventy-fourth Homily[33], in which is a Panegyric upon the martyrs, p. 900, [796,] he speaks again of the Trisagion, or Cherubical Hymn, as used to be sung in the celebration of the eucharist. 'The martyrs,' says he, 'are now joining in concert and partaking in the mystical songs of the heavenly choir: for if, whilst they were in the body, whenever they communicated in the holy mysteries, they made a part of that choir, singing with the Cherubims the trisagion-hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! as all ye that are initiated in those mysteries very well understand: much more now, being joined with them, whose partners they were in the earthly choir, they do with greater freedom partake in those solemn blessings and glorifications of God in heaven above.'

[32] Ibid. (B. ibid. f. S. p. 853. 9.) *Ἐβουλόμην μὲν πρῶτον ἁπάντων εἰπεῖν, τί δήποτε παραδραμόντες ἡμῶν οἱ πατέρες ἅπαντα τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ μυσταγωγεῖσθαι τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐνομοθέτησαν, καί τινος ἕνεκεν μετὰ τὴν παρ' ἡμῶν διδασκαλίαν ὑπολύσαντες ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀποδύσαντες, γυμνοὺς καὶ ἀνυποδέτους, μετὰ τοῦ χιτωνίσκου μόνου, πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἐξορκιζόντων παραπέμπουσι φωνάς. Οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ εἰκῇ, καὶ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνοι τοῦτον ἡμῖν διετύπωσαν· ἀλλ' ἔχει ταῦτα ἀμφότερα μυστικόν τινα λόγον καὶ ἀπόρρητον.*

[33] Hom. 74. (B. p. 715 a. S. t. 5. p. 617. 19.) ..... *Κοινωνοῦσι τῶν χορῶν, καὶ μετέχουσι τῶν μελῶν τῶν μυστικῶν· εἰ γὰρ ἐν σώματι ὄντες κατὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐτέλουν τὸν χορὸν, μετὰ τῶν Χερουβὶμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ψάλλοντες, καθάπερ ὑμεῖς ἴστε οἱ μυηθέντες, πολλῷ μᾶλλον νῦν τοὺς συγχορευτὰς ἀπολαβόντες μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς παρρησίας κοινωνοῦσι τῆς εὐφημίας ἐκείνης.*

Parts of the liturgy in the second tome.

2. The second tome of St. Chrysostom's works consists of his Homilies upon Genesis which were preached in Lent, when that book was always read in the Church, as appears from his first Homily[34], p. 10, [7,] and from what has been observed before[35] out of his seventh Homily to the people of Antioch in the foregoing section. In his twenty-seventh Homily upon this book, he plainly intimates, that the Lord's Prayer was always a part of the communion-office: for, speaking of the duty of forgiving enemies, he says[36], p. 358, [300,] 'If we do this, we may then with a pure conscience come to this holy and tremendous table, and boldly say the words that are contained in that prayer. They, who are initiated in the holy mysteries, know what I mean.' He covertly intends that petition of the Lord's Prayer, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' In his thirty-third Homily[37], p. 478, [596,] he acquaints us, that though the Book of Genesis was by the order of the Church read in Lent, yet when they came to the Thursday in the Passion-week, the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, then they had proper lessons for that day, and Good Friday, and Easter-day, and all the time between Easter and Pentecost, when it was customary to read the Acts of the Apostles, as a demonstration of our Saviour's resurrection. In his fifty-fourth Homily[38], p. 731, he says, Christ commanded the use of the Lord's Prayer, prescribing us there-

[34] Hom. 1. (B. t. 4. p. 7 a. S. t. 1. p. 5. 21.) .... Ἵνα τὸν καιρὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ἁγίας τεσσαρακοστῆς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἐμπορίαν ἐμπορευσάμενοι, κ.τ.λ.

[35] See s. 1. p. 441. n. 6.

[36] Hom. 27. (B. p. 268 a. S. p. 214. 31.) Ἂν τοῦτο κατορθώσωμεν, δυνησόμεθα μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος καὶ τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ φρικτῇ τραπέζῃ προσελθεῖν, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα τὰ τῇ εὐχῇ συνεζευγμένα μετὰ παρρησίας φθέγξασθαι· ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι τὸ λεγόμενον.

[37] Hom. 33. (B. 331 b. S. p. 265. 20.) Ἡ γὰρ τῆς ἁγίας ἑορτῆς παρουσία τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἡμῖν διέκοψεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν εὔλογον, τὸν σταυρὸν ἡμᾶς ἑορτάζοντας τοῦ Δεσπότου περὶ ἕτερα ἡμῖν τὴν διδασκαλίαν γίνεσθαι. ἀλλ' ἐχρῆν καθ' ἕκαστον καιρὸν τὴν ἁρμόττουσαν ὑμῖν παρατιθέναι τράπεζαν. Διά τοι τοῦτο, ἡνίκα ἡ τῆς παραδόσεως ἔφθασεν ἡμέρα, τὴν ἀκολουθίαν διατεμόντες τῆς διδασκαλίας, τοῦ κατεπείγοντος γενόμενοι, ἐπὶ τὸν προδότην τὴν γλῶτταν ἐπαφήκαμεν, καὶ πάλιν τὸ κατὰ τὸν σταυρὸν ὑμῖν εἰς μέσον προεθήκαμεν· εἶτα, ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρας καταλαβούσης, ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τὰ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Δεσπότου διδάξαι τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην, καὶ πάλιν ἐν ταῖς ἐφεξῆς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ὑμῖν παρασχεῖν διὰ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα γεγενημένων θαυμάτων, ὅτε καὶ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν Ἀποστολικῶν ἐπιλαβόμενοι, κ.τ.λ.

[38] Hom. 54. (B. p. 529 e. S. p. 426. 2.) Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς εὐχῆς ῥήμασιν ὅρους ἡμῖν καὶ κανόνας τιθεὶς, μέχρι τίνος δεῖ τὴν περὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν αἴτησιν ποιεῖσθαι, τὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐκέλευσε, ... Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

in the bounds and rules of praying for temporal things, whilst he enjoins us to say those words, Give us this day our daily bread! In his second Homily upon the Prayer of Hannah[39], in the same volume, p. 965, [801,] he says, 'When Christ commanded his disciples not to pray after the manner of the Heathen, using vain repetitions, he also taught us the measure of prayer;' meaning the form which he appointed. He repeats the same in the third Homily upon Saul and David[40], p. 1053, [880,] 'Although,' says he, 'you are guilty of a thousand crimes, yet, if you sincerely offer up that prayer, which promises, that if you forgive your enemies, your Father will forgive your trespasses, you shall with great confidence obtain the remission of all your sins.'

Parts of the ancient liturgy in the third tome.

3. The third tome contains St. Chrysostom's Commentaries and Homilies on the Psalms and the Prophet Isaiah, where he frequently refers to the known parts of the liturgy then in use in the Church. In his Comment upon the 112th Psalm[41] he three times mentions the necessary use of the Lord's Prayer, p. 369. [320.] 'As Christ,' says he, 'when he would induce us to unanimity and charity in our prayers, enjoins us to make common prayer, and obliges the whole Church, as if it were but one person, to say, Our Father; and, Give us this day our daily bread; and, Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us; and, Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; always using a word of the plural number, and commanding every one, whether he pray alone by himself, or in common with others, still to make prayer for his bre-

[39] Hom. 2. de Ann. (B. p. 714 b. S. t. 5. 61. 3.) Οὕτω γοῦν καὶ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπέταξεν εὔχεσθαι. Εἰπὼν γὰρ τοῖς μαθηταῖς, μὴ κατὰ τοὺς ἐθνικοὺς εὔχεσθαι, καὶ μὴ βαττολογεῖν, καὶ μέτρον ἡμᾶς εὐχῆς ἐδίδαξε.

[40] Hom. 3. de Saul. et Dav. (B. p. 783 c. S. p. 99. 32.) . . . . . Κἂν μυρία πεπλημμεληκὼς ᾖς, τὴν εὐχὴν ἐκείνην προτεινόμενος, τὴν λέγουσαν, Ἄφετε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς Παρρησίας τὴν ἄφεσιν λήψῃ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἁπάντων.

[41] Expos. in Ps. 112. (B. t. 5. p. 287 e. S. t. 1. p. 751. 6.) Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνάγων ἡμᾶς εἰς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ ἀγάπην ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς κοινὴν ἐπέταξε ποιεῖσθαι τὴν εὐχὴν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς προσώπου λέγειν· Πάτερ ἡμῶν, καὶ, Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, καὶ, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν [τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν,] καὶ, Μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ· πανταχοῦ τῷ πληθυντικῷ κεχρημένος ὀνόματι, καὶ κελεύων ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ, κἂν καθ' ἑαυτὸν εὔχηται, κἂν κοινῇ, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Προφήτης κοινῇ πάντας εἰς τὴν συμφωνίαν καλεῖ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ λέγει· Αἰνεῖτε τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου.

thren: so here the Prophet David calls all men to a consent in prayer, saying, "Praise the Lord, O ye servants: praise the name of the Lord."' Again[41], p. 370, [321,] speaking of glorifying God, he says, 'Christ hath commanded us to pray for this, saying, whenever we pray, Hallowed be thy name.' And[42], p. 372, [ibid.,] 'Christ in his Gospel hath commanded us to pray, and say, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven!' In like manner, on the 114th Psalm[43], p. 394, [741,] speaking of the life to come, and how we ought to desire it, and make all our actions tend that way, he adds, 'For this reason we are commanded to say in our prayer, Thy kingdom come! that we may always have respect to that day.' He repeats the same words on the 119th Psalm[44], p. 425, [369,] and on the 127th Psalm[45], p. 465, [404,] 'We are commanded to use a prayer, in which there is but one petition relating to this life, Give us this day our daily bread!' Which he repeats again on the 140th Psalm[46], p. 551. [477.] On the 144th Psalm[47], p. 595, [516,] he says, 'We are commanded to say in our prayer, Hallowed be thy name!' And on the 149th Psalm[48], p. 633, [549,] he calls it the prayer, which was offered up by all in common, and always in the plural number, Our Father, &c.! On the 150th Psalm[49], p. 636, [552,]

[41] Ibid. (B. p. 288 c. S. p. 751. 24.) Τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ ἐκέλευσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀεὶ λέγειν εὐχομένους, Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.

[42] Ibid. (B. 289 e. S. p. 752. 27.) Διὸ καὶ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Χριστὸς εὔχεσθαι καὶ λέγειν, Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

[43] In Ps. 114. (B. p. 307 c. S. p. 765. 39.) Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ κελευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· ἵνα ἀεὶ πρὸς ἐκείνην βλέπωμεν τὴν ἡμέραν.

[44] In Ps. 119. (B. p. 332 b. S. p. 783. 43.) Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, κ. τ. λ.

[45] In Ps. 127. (B. p. 364 a. S. p. 807. 36.) Ὑπὲρ δὲ αἰσθητῶν, μίαν λέξιν κελευόμεθα λέγειν. Ποίαν δὲ ταύτην; Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

[46] In Ps. 140. (B. p. 432 b. S. p. 858. 20.) Τί οὖν; Οὐ δεῖ, φησιν, αἰσθητὰ αἰτεῖν; δεῖ μὲν, μετὰ μέτρου δὲ .... ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκέλευσεν εὔχεσθαι λέγοντας, Τὸν ἄρτον, κ.τ.λ.

[47] In Ps. 144. (B. p. 467 c. S. p. 884. 19.) Τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ κελευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.

[48] In Ps. 149. (B. p. 499 b. S. p. 907. 15.) Καὶ αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ εὐχὴ τοῦτο αἰνίττεται, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων ἀναφερομένη, Πάτερ ἡμῶν'... τῷ πληθυντικῷ ὀνόματι κεχρημένους.

[49] In Ps. 150. (B. p. 501 b. S. p. 908. 42.) Οὕτω καὶ τῆς εὐχῆς ἡμῶν τὸ προοίμιον ἐντεῦθεν ἔχει τὴν ἀρχήν· τὸ γὰρ λέγειν, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, εὐχαριστούντων ἐστὶν ἐπὶ ταῖς γεγενημέναις δωρεαῖς, καὶ πάσας αὐτὰς διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου δεικνύντων. Ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν Πατέρα, τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ὡμολόγησεν· ὁ δὲ τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ὁμολογήσας, τὴν δικαιοσύνην, τὸν ἁγιασμὸν, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσιν, τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν χορηγίαν ἀνεκή-

he says this prayer was peculiar in its use to the sons of God only, who could call God their Father by virtue of their regeneration and adoption. 'Our prayer,' says he, 'is prefaced with this title. For it belongs to them only to say, Our Father! who can give him thanks for the gifts which they have received, and show forth them all in that name. For he, that calls God his Father, confesses the adoption of sons: and he, that confesses the adoption of sons, owns and declares both justification, and sanctification, and redemption, and remission of sins, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For all these must go before, that we may thereby enjoy the adoption of sons, and be thought worthy to call God our Father.' By which reasoning of St. Chrysostom it appears, that he was so far from thinking the Lord's Prayer a carnal form, not proper to be used by spiritual men, because it was a form, that on the contrary he thought none were duly qualified to use it, but such as were regenerated, and adopted, and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, who alone had the true title to call God their Father. And this, I shall show in the next chapter, was the general sense of all the ancient writers.

But to return to St. Chrysostom. In his Comment on the 117th Psalm[50], p. 406, [352,] he takes notice, that the people were used in their responses to return one verse of this Psalm, [118, 24.] which was; "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." This kind of responses he calls *ὑπηχεῖν* and *ὑποψάλλειν*, because it was the people's subjoining their response to something that the minister had read before out of the same Psalm. And it seems to have been appointed for the service of Easter-day, or Christmas-day, or the Lord's-day, because he adds, 'the people were wont to make this response chiefly on that spiritual assembly and heavenly festival;' plainly referring to some eminent festival then well known to the people. And that this custom was introduced by a law and order of the Church, is evident from what follows:

ρυξε. Δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα προϋπαρξαι, ὥστε τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἀπολαῦσαι, καὶ καλέσαι Πατέρα ἀξιωθῆναι.

[50] In Ps. 117. (B. p. 317 a. S. p. 772. 38.) *Ἡ μὲν ῥῆσις τοῦ ψαλμοῦ, ἣν ὑποψάλλειν ὁ λαὸς εἴωθε, τοιαύτη τίς ἐστιν· Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἡμέρα, ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος· ἀγαλλιασώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθῶμεν ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ πολλοὺς διανίστησι, καὶ κατὰ τὴν πανήγυριν ἐκείνην τὴν πνευματικὴν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν οὐράνιον ἑορτὴν, μάλιστα τοῦτο ὑπηχεῖν ὁ λαὸς εἴωθεν.*

for he says[51], 'their forefathers *had appointed the people to sing this verse,* ὑπηχεῖν ἐνομοθέτησαν, both because it was sonorous and also contained a sublime doctrine, that forasmuch as they knew not the whole Psalm, they might from this one verse be perfectly instructed in the mystery of it.' This was the wisdom of the ancient Church, according to Chrysostom, to teach the people the mysteries of religion, by obliging them to bear a part in the usual service.

In his Comment on the 137th Psalm[52], p. 518, [449,] he declares again, that the psalmody was performed partly by the priests, and partly by the people's joining with them: the priests began, and the people answered to them. On the 140th Psalm[53] he notes, p. 544, [472,] that this Psalm was constantly sung in the order of the daily evening service, whence it had the name of the Evening Psalm, as the 62nd had the name of the Morning Psalm, because it was always sung in the morning service. Of which, because I shall give a more particular account of it hereafter[54], I say no more in this place. On the 144th Psalm[55], p. 594, [516,] he acquaints us, that this Psalm was always sung alternately by the priest and people at the Lord's table, chiefly upon the account of these words in it, [145, 15.] "The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season." Of which custom we shall have another occasion[56] to speak further in its proper place.

In his Sermon on the 145th Psalm[57], p. 823, [713,] he tells us,

[51] Ibid. (B. p. 317 b. S. p. 773. 2.) Τὸν μὲν στίχον οἱ πατέρες, ἅτε ἦχον ὄντα καί τι ὑψηλὸν ἔχοντα δόγμα τὸ πλῆθος ὑπηχεῖν ἐνομοθέτησαν, ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἅπαντα ἠγνόουν ψαλμόν· ἵνα κἂν ἐντεῦθεν ἀπηρτισμένην λάβωσι διδασκαλίαν.

[52] In Ps. 137. (B. p. 405 d. S. p. 838. 35.) Ἂν τοίνυν τοῦτο ἐκλαβεῖν ᾖ, ἐκεῖνο νοεῖν δεῖ, ὅτι μετὰ τῶν ἱερέων, παρόντων αὐτῶν, μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης εὐταξίας καταρχομένων ἐκείνων, προηγουμένων ἕψομαι, καὶ ἀκολουθήσω, καὶ ᾄσω σοι, κ.τ.λ.

[53] In Ps. 140. (B. p. 427 a. (S. p. 854. 31.) Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἁπλῶς οἶμαι τὸν ψαλμὸν τοῦτον τετάχθαι παρὰ τῶν πατέρων καθ' ἑκάστην ἑσπέραν λέγεσθαι, οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν μίαν λέξιν τὴν λέγουσαν, Ἔπαρσις τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἑσπερινή· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄλλοι ψαλμοὶ ταύτην ἔχουσι τὴν λέξιν. Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν τοῦτον τὸν ψαλμὸν ἐτύπωσαν οἱ πατέρες, ἀλλ' ὥς τι φάρμακον σωτήριον, καὶ ἁμαρτημάτων καθάρσιον ἐνομοθέτησαν λέγεσθαι.... Τοιοῦτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἑωθινὸς ψαλμός· κ. τ. λ.

[54] See chapters 10 and 11 of this Book.

[55] In Ps. 144. (B. p. 466 e. S. p. 884. 2.) Οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τὰ ῥήματα ἔχων ταῦτα, ἅπερ οἱ μεμνημένοι συνεχῶς ὑποψάλλουσι, λέγοντες, Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ πάντων εἰς σὲ ἐλπίζουσι, καὶ σὺ δίδως τὴν τροφὴν αὐτῶν ἐν εὐκαιρίᾳ. Ὁ γὰρ γενόμενος Υἱὸς, καὶ τραπέζης ἀπολαύων πνευματικῆς, δοξάζειν δίκαιος ἂν εἴη τὸν Πατέρα.

[56] See B. 15. ch. 5. s. 10.

[57] In Ps. 145. (B. Hom. in Magn. Hebdomadam et Ps. 145. p. 526 d.

that Psalm was used to be sung in the Passion-week: [146, 1, 2.] "Praise the Lord, O my soul, while I live will I praise the Lord, &c." In his first Sermon on Isaiah[58], p. 834, [724,] he says, the trisagion, or cherubical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! was sung by the Seraphims in heaven above, and by men on earth beneath. And[59], p. 836, [725,] he takes notice of the angelical doxology, Glory be to God on high! as used in the Church: and the forms, Κύριε ἐλέησον, and Κύριε σῶσον, *Lord have mercy upon us!* and, *Lord save us!* as usual prayers and responses of the people: and reproving the people's clamours, and negligence, and indecent gesticulations in the church, he reprimands them in this manner[60]: 'How dare you mix the Devil's sport with this doxology of angels? Why do you not revere the words which you yourselves use in that place, *Serve the Lord in fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence?* Is this to serve him in fear, when you thus theatrically toss and stretch your bodies, and know not what you say yourselves for your disorderly vociferation?' This plainly implies, that the people bare their part, though sometimes without a just decorum, in all these doxologies, prayers and responses. In his Sermon upon the Seraphims, which is the sixth upon Isaiah[61], p. 890, [772, 773,] he gives a large account again of the use of the seraphical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! at the communion-table: which

S. t. 5. p. 541. 42.) Ταύτην καὶ ἡμεῖς τιμῶμεν τὴν ἑβδομάδα'... ἐξέλθωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν φοινίκων βαΐων προαίρεσιν θάλλουσαν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι βοήσωμεν, καθάπερ σήμερον ὑπεψάλλομεν· Αἴνει, ἡ ψυχή μου, τὸν Κύριον· αἰνέσω Κύριον ἐν ζωῇ.

[58] Hom. in Esai. (B. t. 6. In Illud, Vidi Dominum, Hom. 1, &c. p. 95 d. S. t. 5. p. 127. 44.) Ἄνω τὰ Σεραφὶμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἀναβοᾷ· κάτω τὸν αὐτὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμπει πληθύς· κοινὴ τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων συγκροτεῖται πανήγυρις.

[59] (Ibid. (B. p. 97 d. S. p. 129. 9.) Πῶς εἰς οἶκτον ἐπισπάσῃ τὸν Δεσπότην, οὕτω καταπεφρονημένως τὴν δέησιν προτεινόμενος; Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεὸς, λέγεις, καὶ τοῦ ἐλέους ἀλλότριον τὸ ἦθος ἐπιδείκνυσαι. Σῶσόν με, βοᾷς, καὶ ξένον τῆς σωτηρίας τὸ σχῆμα διατυποῖς. Τί συντείνουσι πρὸς ἱκεσίαν χεῖρες ἐπὶ μετεωρισμῷ συνεχῶς ἐπαιρόμεναι καὶ ἀτάκτως περιφερόμεναι, κραυγή τε σφοδρὰ, καὶ τῇ βιαίᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος ὠθήσει τὸ ἄσημον ἔχουσα; Οὐχὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς τριόδοις ἑταιριζομένων γυναικῶν; τὰ δὲ τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις φωνούντων ἐστὶν ἔργα;

[60] Ibid. (B. p. 97 e. S. p. 129. 14.) Πῶς οὖν τολμᾷς τῇ ἀγγελικῇ ταύτῃ δοξολογίᾳ τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀναμιγνύειν παίγνια; Πῶς δὲ οὐκ αἰδῇ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν, ἣν ἐκεῖ ἐκφέρεις, Δουλεύσατε τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ, λέγων, καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ; Τοῦτο ἔστιν ἐν φόβῳ δουλεύειν, τὸ διακεχῦσθαί τε καὶ διατείνεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲ σεαυτὸν ἐπίστασθαι, περὶ τίνων διαλέγῃ τῇ ἀτάκτῳ τῆς φωνῆς ἐνηχήσει.

[61] Hom. in Seraph. (B. ibid. In Illud, Vide Dominum, &c. Hom. 6. p. 141 b. S. t. 5. p. 158. 7.) Ἆρα ἐπέγνωτε τὴν φωνὴν ταύτην; ἆρα ἡμετέρα ἐστὶν ἢ τῶν Σεραφίμ; κ. τ. λ.

because I shall recite at length hereafter[62], I only just barely hint it in this place.

In his second Homily upon the Obscurity of the ancient Prophecies[63], p. 946, [821,] in answer to that vulgar plea, that men could pray at home, he replies in such a manner, as shows that the people bare a part with their own tongues in the common prayers of the Church. 'You may pray at home,' says he, 'but your prayer is not of that efficacy and power as when the whole body of the Church, *with one mind, and one voice, ὁμοθυμαδὸν, μιᾷ φωνῇ,* send up their prayers together, the priests assisting, and offering up the prayers of the whole multitude in common.' He there also speaks of the deacon's form in bidding prayer for all orders of men in the world, which I shall not recite here, because I shall do it more fully in its proper place[64].

Parts of the ancient liturgy in the fourth tome.

4. The fourth tome of St. Chrysostom's works consists chiefly of private discourses, which have not much relation to the public liturgy of the Church: yet some few passages are worthy to be noted among these. In his famous Discourse upon Eutropius[65], p. 554, [485,] among other arguments, whereby he presses the people to lay aside their anger against him, and pardon the injury he had done them, he urges this: 'How will you otherwise,' says he, 'take the holy sacrament into your hands, and use the words of that prayer wherein we are commanded to say, Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us! if you exact punishment of your debtor?' This shows that the Lord's Prayer was used then as an usual part of the communion-service. In the third Homily of Repentance[66], p. 562, [493,] he speaks of the seraphical hymn under the title of '*μυστικὸν μέλος, the mystical song,*' because

[62] See B. 15. ch. 3. s. 10., in the next volume.

[63] Hom. 2. de Prophet. Obscurit. (B. ibid. p. 187 d. S. t. 6. p. 662. 44. et p. 663. 1.) *Δύνασαι μὲν εὔξασθαι [ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ]· οὐ τοσαύτην δὲ δύναμιν ἔχει ἡ εὐχὴ, ὡς ὅταν μετὰ τῶν μελῶν τῶν οἰκείων γίνηται, ὡς ὅταν ὁλόκληρον τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀναπέμπει τὴν δέησιν μιᾷ φωνῇ, ἱερέων παρόντων καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς τοῦ κοινοῦ πλήθους ἀναφερόντων.*

[64] B. 15. ch. 1. s. 2, as above.

[65] Hom. in Eutrop. (B. t. 3. p. 385 b. S. t. 8. p. 70. 40.) *Πῶς δὲ, τοῦ θεάτρου τούτου λυθέντος, ὑμεῖς μυστηρίων ἅψεσθε, καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐρεῖτε ἐκείνην, δι' ἧς κελευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, τὸν ὑμῶν ὀφειλέτην ἀπαιτοῦντες δίκην;*

[66] Hom. 3. de Pœnitent. (B. Hom. 8. t. 2. p. 344 e. S. Hom. 4. t. 6. p. 787. 35.) *Παρέστω τοίνυν Ἠσαΐας, ὁ τῶν Σεραφὶμ θεωρὸς, ὁ τὸ μυστικὸν μέλος ἀκούσας ἐκεῖνο, κ. τ. λ.*

it was used in the celebration of the holy mysteries. And again in his second Epistle to Olympias[67], p. 715, [625,] he mentions it under the same title. And in his Sermon after his return from banishment[68], p. 971, [848,] he speaks of the form Εἰρήνη πᾶσι, *Peace be to you all!* as a solemn form used frequently in the Church.

In the fifth tome.

5. The fifth tome of his works affords us many more examples. Here he no less than eight times mentions the Lord's Prayer as a form in common use by the commandment of Christ. In his sixth Homily upon Lazarus[69], p. 107, [100,] 'We are commanded in our prayer to say, *Forgive us our trespasses*, that by the continual use of that prayer we may be put in mind that we are liable to punishment.' In his eighth Homily on our Saviour's prayer[70], "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," p. 134, [124,] he says, 'Christ prayed, to teach his disciples to pray. But they were to learn not only to pray, but after what manner to pray: and therefore he delivered them a prayer in these words, commanding them and us to say, Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.' In his tenth Homily[71], p. 154, [141,] he says, 'Christ taught us what we are to say in prayer, and in a few words instructed us in all manner of virtue.' In his sixteenth Homily upon those words[72], "If thine enemy

[67] Ep. 2. ad Olymp. (B. t. 3. p. 548 d. S. t. 7. p. 65. 19.) ...Ὁ Παῦλος, ὁ τὴν σάρκα ἀποδυσάμενος, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀποθέμενος, ... καὶ μετὰ τῶν Χερουβὶμ ἑστὼς ἄνω, καὶ τῆς μυστικῆς ἐκείνης μελῳδίας αὐτοῖς κοινωνῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[68] Serm. post. Redit. (B. Serm. 2. ibid. p. 427. S. t. 8. p. 262. 14.) Ὅτε τὴν Σάρραν, κ. τ. λ. [After a diligent search, I am as unable as Grischovius to find anything according to the citation as above *de formula;* though, towards the close of the address, there occur some brief exhortations on peace, which the learned Author may have had in mind. See further on, s. 7, where he cites Hom. in Matt. 33., and s. 10, where he gives other instances out of Hom. 3. in Coloss. Ed.]

[69] Hom. 6. in Laz. (B. t. 1. p. 786 d. S. t. 6. p. 678. 14.) Διὰ τοῦτο κελευόμεθα εἰς τὴν εὐχὴν λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ἵνα τῇ συνηθείᾳ τῆς εὐχῆς ἀναμνησθῶμεν ἐκεῖ, ὅτι ὑπεύθυνοί ἐσμεν κολάσεσι.

[70] Hom. 8. In illud, Pater, si possibile, &c. (B. t. 3. p. 23 c. S. t. 5. p. 219. 36.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ εὔχεται, ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι μάθωσιν εὔχεσθαι· ἀλλ' οὐκ εὔχεσθαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πῶς δεῖ εὔχεσθαι, μαθεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐχρῆν. Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ εὐχὴν παρέδωκεν οὕτως ἔχουσαν, Πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, κ. τ. λ.

[71] Hom. 10. In illud, Angusta est porta, &c. (B. ibid. 3. p. 28 a. S. ibid. p. 185. 13.) Διδάσκει δὲ, τίνα χρὴ λέγειν ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγοις ῥήμασι πάσαν ἀρετὴν ἐκπαιδεύει.

[72] Hom. 16. In illud, Si esurierit, &c. (B. ibid. p. 170 c. S. ibid. p. 313. 40.) Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐδιδάχθημεν λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν, καθὼς ἀφίεμεν· ἵνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀφέσεως παρ' ἡμῶν πρῶτον λαμβάνει τὴν ἀρχήν.

hunger, feed him," p. 237, [216,] he urges forgiveness of injuries with this argument, 'For this reason we are taught to say, *Forgive us as we forgive,* that we may learn, that the measure of forgiveness takes its rise from ourselves.' In his thirty-sixth Homily upon Pentecost[73], p. 552, [493,] he says, praying by the Lord's Prayer is praying by the Spirit: his words are these: 'If there was no Holy Ghost, we that are believers could not pray to God: for we say, *Our Father, which art in heaven.* As therefore we could not say that Jesus was the Lord, so neither could we call God our Father, without the Holy Ghost. How does that appear? From the same Apostle, who says, *Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*' In his thirty-eighth Homily of Repentance and the Eucharist[74], p. 570, [509,] he thus again argues for forgiving enemies: 'When we go into the church, let us approach God as becomes his majesty, lest, if we have designs of revenge in our hearts when we pray, we pray against ourselves, saying, *Forgive us as we forgive them that trespass against us!* These are terrible words, and the same as if one said to God, Lord, I have forgiven my enemy, forgive thou me: I have loosed him, loose thou me: I have pardoned my enemy, pardon me: if I have retained his sins, retain thou mine: if I have not loosed my neighbour, do not thou loose my offences: what measure I have meted to him, measure to me again.' In his fifty-first Homily upon the Prayers of Christ[75], p. 691, [617,] he says, 'Christ taught his disciples to pray both

73 Hom. 36. de S. Pentecost. (B. t. 2. p. 462 e. S. t. 5. p. 605. 41.) Εἰ μὴ Πνεῦμα ἦν Ἅγιον, τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλέσαι οὐκ ἠδυνάμεθα οἱ πιστοί· λέγομεν γὰρ, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Ὥσπερ οὖν Κύριον καλέσαι οὐκ ἠδυνάμεθα, οὕτως οὐδὲ Πατέρα τὸν Θεὸν καλέσαι ἠδυνάμεθα. Πόθεν δῆλον; ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέγοντος, Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοὶ, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, κράζον, Ἀββὰ ὁ Πατήρ.

74 Hom. 38. (B. de Pœnitent. Hom. 9. ibid. 350 c. S. de Pœnitent. Hom. 5. t. 6. p. 791. 37.) Εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς Θεῷ πρέπει, εἰσέλθωμεν, μὴ μνησικακίαν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἔχοντες, μήπως εὐχόμενοι, καθ' ἑαυτῶν εὐχώμεθα, λέγοντες, Ἄφες ἡμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. Φοβερὸν γάρ ἐστι τὸ λεγόμενον, καὶ, σχεδὸν εἰπεῖν, τοιοῦτο πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν βοᾷ ὁ τοῦτο λέγων· Ἄφηκα, Δέσποτα, ἄφες· ἔλυσα, λῦσον· συνεχώρησα, συγχώρησον· εἰ ἐκράτησα, κράτησον· εἰ μὴ ἔλυσα τῷ πλησίον, μηδὲ σὺ λύσῃς τὰ ἐμὰ ἁμαρτήματα· ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ ἐμέτρησα, ἀντιμετρηθήτω μοι.

75 Hom. 51. (B. cont. Anomœos 10. t. 1. p. 532 a. S. ibid. p. 716. 12.) Διά τοι τοῦτο οὐχὶ διδάσκει αὐτοὺς [μαθητευομένους] μόνον τὴν διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς διατελεῖ τοῦτο ποιῶν, καὶ εὔχεται διανυκτερεύων ἐν ταῖς ἐρημίαις, ἡμᾶς παιδεύων καὶ νουθετῶν, κ. τ. λ.

in words and actions;' meaning the words of the Lord's Prayer, together with his own example. And in the sixty-second Homily upon the Paralytic[76], p. 934, [836,] he says, 'This prayer was the peculiar privilege of the faithful, and not allowed to any unbaptized catechumen: for before we have washed away our sins in the font of the holy waters, we cannot call God our Father: but when we return from thence, having put off the burden of our sins, then we say, *Our Father, which art in heaven.*'

Besides this account of the various use of the Lord's Prayer, he mentions several other parcels of the liturgy in this volume. In the sixteenth Homily[77], p. 229, [208,] he takes notice of the use of the seraphical hymn in the eucharistical service. 'Consider,' says he, 'you that are initiated, what a mystical service you have been employed in; with whom you have sent up that mystical song; with whom you have cried out, Τρισάγιος! Holy! Holy! Holy!' In the thirty-sixth Homily upon Pentecost and the Holy Spirit[78], p. 553, [493,] he treats at large of that ancient form of salutation used in every office, Peace be with you! or, The Lord be with you! and the people's answering always, And with thy spirit! 'Our common father and teacher,' says he, meaning the bishop, 'when he goes up

[76] Hom. 62. (B. t. 3. p. 42 e. Deest in Edit. Savil.) . . . 'Ημεῖς οὐ πρότερον δυνάμεθα καλέσαι Πατέρα, ἕως ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τῶν ὑδάτων τῶν ἁγίων ἀπονιψώμεθα τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, ὅταν γοῦν ἐκεῖθεν ἀνέλθωμεν, τὸ πονηρὸν ἐκεῖνο φορτίον ἀποθέμενοι, τότε λέγομεν, Πάτηρ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

[77] Hom. 16. In illud, Si esurierit, &c. (B. t. 3. p. 164 b. S. t. 5. p. 309. 16.) Ἐννόησον οἵας ἀπολαύεις μυσταγωγίας ὁ μεμυημένος σὺ, μετὰ τίνων ἀναπέμπεις τὸ μυστικὸν μέλος ἐκεῖνο, μετὰ τίνων βοᾷς τὸ Τρισάγιος. [Conf. Hom. de SS. Martyr. (B. t. 2. p. 715 b. S. t. 5. p. 617. 19.) Εἰ γὰρ ἐν σώματι ὄντες κατὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐτέλουν τὸν χορὸν, μετὰ τῶν Χερουβὶμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ψάλλοντες, καθάπερ ὑμεῖς ἔστε οἱ μυηθέντες, κ. τ. λ. Ed.] Conf. etiam In illud, Vide Dominum, &c. Hom. 5. c. 3 tot. (B. t. 6. p. 141 b.) Ἄρα ἐπέγνωτε τὴν φωνὴν ταύτην, κ. τ. λ.

[78] Hom. 36. de Pentecost. (B. ibid. p. 463 a. S. ibid. p. 606. 7.) Εἰ μὴ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἦν ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τούτῳ πατρὶ καὶ διδασκάλῳ, οὐκ ἄν, ὅτε πρὸ μικροῦ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βῆμα τοῦτο, καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ἔδωκεν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἐπεφθέγξασθε αὐτῷ κοινῇ πάντες, Καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναβαίνοντι μόνον, οὐδὲ διαλεγομένῳ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, οὐδὲ εὐχομένῳ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ταύτην ἐπιφθέγγεσθε τὴν ῥῆσιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν παρὰ τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην ἑστήκῃ τράπεζαν· ὅταν τὴν φρικτὴν ἐκείνην θυσίαν ἀναφέρειν μέλλῃ· ἴσασι γὰρ οἱ μεμυημένοι τὸ λεγόμενον· οὐ πρότερον ἅπτεται τῶν προκειμένων, ἕως ἂν ὑμῖν αὐτὸς ἐπεύξηται τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Κύριου χάριν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπιφθέγξησθε αὐτῷ, Καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου, διὰ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως αὐτῆς ἀναμιμνήσκοντες αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτὸς ὁ παρὼν πράττει, οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐστὶ φύσεως, κατορθώματα τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα, ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις παροῦσα καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφιπταμένη τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην κατασκευάζει θυσίαν.

into his throne, says, Peace be to you all! and you all make answer with one common voice, And with thy spirit! Neither do you make this answer only when he goes into his throne, or when he preaches to you, or when he prays for you, but when he stands by the holy table: when he is about to offer that tremendous sacrifice, (they that are initiated know what I say,) before he touches the elements lying upon the table, he prays, The grace of the Lord be with you! and ye reply, And with thy spirit! reminding yourselves by this answer, that it is not the minister that effects any thing in this matter, neither is the consecration of the gifts the work of human nature, but that it is the grace of the Spirit then present, and descending upon the elements, which consummates that mystical sacrifice.' In the thirty-eighth Homily on the Eucharist and Repentance[79], p. 569, [477,] he takes notice of another known form in the communion-service, where the priest says, Let us lift up our minds and hearts! and the people answer, We lift them up unto the Lord! This is the same form as we have seen before[80] in Cyprian, *Sursum Corda!* and *Habemus ad Dominum!* In the forty-seventh [fiftieth] Homily[81], p. 632, [565,] he speaks again of the seraphical hymn, taken out of Isaiah, under the name of *μυστικὸν μέλος, the mystical song.* And in the fifty-second [fifty-fifth] Homily[82], *In eos, qui pascha jejunant,* p. 713, [637,] persuading men to peace and unity, he argues again from the frequent use of the form, *Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν, Peace be with you all!* in every office of the Church. 'There is nothing,' says he, 'can be compared with

[79] Hom. 38. (B. de Pœnitent. Hom. 9. ibid. p. 349 c. S. t. 6. p. 791. 9.) *Τί ποιεῖς, ἄνθρωπε; οὐχ ὑπέσχου τῷ ἱερεῖ εἰπόντι, Ἀνασχῶμεν ἡμῶν τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς καρδίας, καὶ εἶπας, Ἔχομὲν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον; κ. τ. λ.*

[80] [See ch. 5. s. 6. p. 396. n. 21., and compare s. 7. p. 414. n. 70. Ed.]

[81] Hom. 47. (B. t. 3. p. 98 d. S. t. 8. p. 61. 9.) . . . . *Ἡσαΐας . . . . ὁ τοῦ μυστικοῦ μέλους ἐκείνου καταξιωθεὶς ἀκούειν, κ. τ. λ.*

[82] Hom. 52. (B. t. 1. p. 614 c. S. t. 6. p. 383. 36.) *Οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰρήνης ἴσον καὶ συμφωνίας. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ εἰσιὼν ὁ πατὴρ, οὐ πρότερον ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον ἀναβαίνει τοῦτον, ἕως ἂν ἅπασιν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην ἐπεύξηται· καὶ ἀναστὰς οὐ πρότερον ἄρχεται τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς διδασκαλίας, ἕως ἂν ἅπασι δῷ τὴν εἰρήνην· καὶ μέλλοντες εὐλογεῖν ἱερεῖς, πρότερον τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἐπευξάμενοι, οὕτω τῆς εὐλογίας ἄρχονται. καὶ ὁ διάκονος δὲ, κελεύων εὔχεσθαι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιτάττει κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν αἰτεῖν τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς εἰρήνης· καὶ τὰ προκείμενα πάντα εἰρηνικά· καὶ τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἀπολύων ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἐπεύχεται λέγων, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ· καὶ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἕνι οὔτε εἰπεῖν, οὔτε πράξαι, ταύτης χωρίς.*

peace and concord. Therefore the bishop, when he first enters the church, before he goes up into his throne, prays, saying, Peace be with you all! And when he rises up, he does not begin to preach, before he says again, Peace be with you all! And the priests, when they are about to say any prayer of benediction, do not begin the blessing, before they have used the same form of salutation. And the deacon, when he bids men pray with others, enjoins them this in their prayers, that they should pray for the angel of peace[83], and that all their purposes may be directed to a peaceable end: and when he dismisses you from this assembly, he prays thus, saying, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Go in peace!* and nothing is said or done without this.' So that it seems this was a form, that had its return in every particular office, and was sometimes used six or seven times at one assembly of the Church. In his thirty-fifth [thirty-eighth] Homily upon the Ascension[84], p. 535, [477,] he more particularly takes notice of this form of the deacon's bidding men pray for the angel of peace. In his *Admonition to those that are scandalized at the evils which befall the Church*[85], ch. 4. p. 863, [772,] he has again occasion to mention the seraphical hymn under the foresaid title of *the mystical song of sanctification.* In his sixty-third [sixty-sixth] Homily[86], p. 949, [849,] he shows us, how by the order of the Church, on the day of our Saviour's passion, all such portions of Scripture were read, as had any relation to the cross; and on the great Sabbath, on Saturday following, such Scriptures as contained the history of his being betrayed, crucified, dead, and buried. And he adds[87], p. 951, [852,] that on

[83] See this *formula* explained, b. 14. ch. 5. s. 4.

[84] Hom. 35. (B. t. 2. p. 448 d. S. t. 5. p. 596. 15.) .... Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι ἄγγελοι εἰρήνης εἰσὶν, ἄκουσον ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἀεὶ λεγόντων τῶν διακόνων, Τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς εἰρήνης αἰτήσατε.

[85] Ad eos qui, &c. (B. t. 3. p. 470 a. S. t. 7. p. 4. 26.) ... Καὶ μόνον ἐδοξολόγουν, μόνον ὕμνουν, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς φρίκης τὸ μυστικὸν ἐκεῖνο τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ ἀναφέρουσαι μέλος.

[86] Hom. 63. (B. Cur in Pentecost. Act. legantur. ibid. p. 88 a. Deest in Ed. Savil.) Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάντα ἀναγινώσκομεν· ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ τῷ μεγάλῳ πάλιν, ὅτι παρεδόθη ἡμῶν ὁ Κύριος, ὅτι ἐσταυρώθη, ὅτι ἀπέθανε τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὅτι ἐτάφη.

[87] Ibid. (B. p. 89 d. In Ed. Savil. non reperitur.) Τὰ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σταυροῦ ἀναγινώσκομεν, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ ἐν ἑκάστῃ ἑορτῇ γεγονότα τῇ αὐτῇ πάλιν ἀναγινώσκομεν. .... Μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν εὐθέως ἀνάστασιν καταγγέλλομεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς δὲ ἀναστάσεως ἀπόδειξίς ἐστι τὰ σημεῖα τὰ ἀποστολικὰ, τῶν δὲ σημείων ἀποστολικῶν διδασκαλεῖόν ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον· ὃ

Easter-day they read such passages as gave an account of his resurrection, and on every festival the things that happened at that season. Only the Acts of the Apostles, which contain the history of the miracles done by the Apostles after Pentecost, after the Holy Ghost was come upon them, were for a particular reason ordered to be read before Pentecost, that is, immediately after Easter, because the miracles of the Apostles, contained in that book, were the great demonstration of our Saviour's resurrection: for which reason the Church appointed the book of the Acts always to be read in the time between Easter and Whitsuntide, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, to give men the evidences and proofs of that holy mystery, which was the completion of their redemption. Thus, according to Chrysostom, the Church in great wisdom ordered and methodized her liturgy by exact rules, for the better instruction and edification of the people.

In the sixth tome.

6. The sixth tome is chiefly made up of such Tracts as do not acknowledge Chrysostom for their author: and therefore among these we shall not be very curious in searching for the forms of the ancient liturgy. Some of them are supposed by learned men to be written by Severianus, bishop of Gabala [in Syria,] contemporary with Chrysostom, and these may be reckoned of the same authority as Chrysostom's own writings. Among the Homilies of this sort is reckoned the thirty-seventh upon the parable of the Prodigal Son[88], where the author,

τοίνυν μάλιστα πιστοῦται τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν δεσποτικὴν, τοῦτο μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὴν ζωηφόρον ἀνάστασιν εὐθέως οἱ πατέρες ἐνομοθέτησαν ἀναγινώσκεσθαι. Διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐθέως ἀναγινώσκομεν τὰ σημεῖα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἵνα ἔχωμεν σαφῆ καὶ ἀναμφισβήτητον τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀπόδειξιν.

[88] Hom. 37. de Fil. Prod. (B. t. 8. int. Spuria, p. 37 a. S. t. 7. p. 543. 16.) *Ἐπίστασθε τὴν πνευματικὴν εὐφροσύνην, οἱ ταύτης γευσάμενοι, καὶ μεμυημένοι τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων, τῶν λειτουργῶν τῆς θείας ἱερουργίας, τῶν μιμουμένων τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων πτέρυγας ταῖς λεπταῖς ὀθόναις, ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ὤμων κειμέναις, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ περιτρεχόντων καὶ βοώντων, Μή τις τῶν κατηχουμένων; μή τις τῶν μὴ ἐσθιόντων, μή τις τῶν κατασκόπων, μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων θεάσασθαι τὸν μόσχον ἐσθιόμενον, μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων θεάσασθαι τὸ οὐράνιον αἷμα, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, μή τις ἀνάξιος τῆς ζώσης θυσίας, μή τις ἀμύητος, μή τις μὴ δυνάμενος ἀκαθάρτοις χείλεσι προσψαύσασθαι τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων. Εἶται καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων οὐρανόθεν ἐπευφημούντων καὶ λεγόντων, Ἅγιος ὁ Πατὴρ, ὁ θελήσας τυθῆναι τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτὸν, τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν, καθώς φησιν ὁ προφήτης Ἡσαΐας· Ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Ἅγιος ὁ Υἱὸς, ἅμα καὶ μόσχος, ὁ ἀεὶ θυόμενος ἐκὼν, καὶ ἀεὶ ζῶν. Ἅγιος ὁ Παράκλητος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ τὴν θυσίαν τελεσιουργῆσαν.*

p. 375, [313,] commenting upon those words, "They began to be merry," thus discourses: 'Ye know what spiritual mirth is, who have tasted of it, who have been partakers of the holy mysteries, and have seen the deacons or ministers of divine service, imitating the wings of angels with their little veils lying upon their left shoulders, and traversing the church, and crying, Let no catechumen be present, none of those that may not eat, no spy, none of those that may not see the feast of the fatted calf, none of those that may not look upon the heavenly blood shed for the remission of sins, no one that is unworthy of the living sacrifice, no one that is yet unbaptized, no one that may not with his polluted lips touch the tremendous mysteries. Ye remember how after this the angels from heaven sing the hymns and praises, saying, Holy is the Father, who willed the fatted calf to be slain, who knew no sin, as saith the Prophet Isaiah, Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Holy is the Son, the calf that is always willingly slain, and always lives. Holy is the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, which perfects the sacrifice.' These are plain references and allusions to the usual forms of the Church, viz. to the deacons vested in their proper habit and badge, calling to all non-communicants to withdraw; and to the seraphical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! which was always sung in the communion-service. The same writer a little after [89], p. 377, [316,] as plainly alludes to the use of the Lord's Prayer at the eucharist, when he brings in the father thus speaking to the elder son: 'Son, thou art ever with me: thou standest by the altar, and there criest out with freedom, *Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.*'

In the first Homily in this volume, intituled *De Uno Legislatore* [90], p. 10, [9,] there is mention made of the ceremony of laying the book of the Gospels upon a bishop's head at his ordination. 'For this reason,' says the author, 'when priests

[89] Ibid. (B. p. 38 a. S. p. 544. 16.) Τέκνον, σὺ πάντοτε μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ· . . . σὺ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παριστάμενος, μετὰ παρρησίας βοᾷς, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου.

[90] Hom. 1. de Uno Legislat. (B. t. 6. p. 410 b. S. t. 6. p. 645. 15.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν ταῖς χειροτονίαις τῶν ἱερέων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς τίθεται, ἵνα μάθῃ ὁ χειροτονούμενος, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθινὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τιάραν λαμβάνει· καὶ ἵνα μάθῃ, ὅτι εἰ καὶ πάντων ἐστι κεφαλή, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τούτους πράττει νόμους· πάντων κρατῶν, καὶ τῷ νόμῳ κρατούμενος· πάντα λογοθετῶν, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου νομοθετούμενος.

are ordained in the Church, the Gospel of Christ is laid upon their heads, that he that is ordained may learn that he receives the true tire or covering of the Gospel; and that he may be taught, that though he be the head of all, yet he is subject to those laws; though he rules over all, he is under the rule of those laws: though he gives laws to all others, he is to be governed by the law himself.' The critics are not agreed upon the author of this discourse. Du Pin [91] rejects it as none of Chrysostom's, but Photius [92] quotes it under his name, and Bishop Pearson [93] has a long dissertation to vindicate the authority of it out of Photius and several ancient writers before him, where he answers all the objections that Bishop Usher and some other learned men had raised against it. Without deciding this controversy, it is sufficient for our present purpose, that the Homily either acknowledges Chrysostom or some such other ancient writer for its author, and that the ceremony here spoken of was certainly a custom observed in the ordination of bishops in the time of Chrysostom, as appears not only from other places in Chrysostom, but also from the authors of the Constitutions and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and the canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, which I have had an occasion to produce in a former Book [94], to which I refer the reader, and go on with Chrysostom in order.

In the fifty-second Homily upon the Circus [95] in this volume, p. 491, [412,] the author makes mention of that ancient custom of saying, Δόξα σοι, Κύριε, *Glory be to thee, O Lord!* at the reading of the Gospel. 'When we are met together,' says he, 'in the ecclesiastical theatre, as soon as the deacon opens the book of the Gospels, we all look upon him with silence, and

[91] Bibliothéque, Cent. v. p. 22. (t. 3. p. 25.) Car, 1, le stile en est tout-a-fait different de celui de Saint Chrysostome. 2. Elle est pleine d'allegories, qui sont rares dans Saint Chrysostome, &c.—assigning six other reasons.

[92] [Biblioth. cod. 277. (p. 1551.) Ex oratione, quod Antiqui Testamenti Unus sit Legislator, &c. Ed.]

[93] Vindic. Ignat. part 1. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. pp. 311, seqq.) Quid de illa oratione senserit vir doctissimus, &c.

[94] B. 2. ch. 11. s. 8. v. 1. p. 141. n. 69. Episcopus cum ordinatur, &c.

[95] Hom. 52. de Circ. (B. t. 8. int. Spuria, p. 89 b. S. t. 6. p. 975. 21.) Οὐδὲν ἧττον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν θεωρίαν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἀθροιζόμενοι, τοῦ διακόνου ἀνοίγειν μέλλοντος τὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τετράθυρον, πάντες αὐτῷ ἀτενίζομεν ἡσυχίαν παρέχοντες· καὶ ἡνίκα τοῦ δρόμου τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἄρξηται, εὐθέως διανιστάμεθα ἡμεῖς, ἐπιφωνοῦντες, Ἀλλὰ δόξα σοι, Κύριε.

when he begins to read, we presently rise up, and say, Glory be to thee, O Lord.'

In the seventh tome of his Homilies.

7. In his eleventh Homily on St. Matthew[95], p. 108, [t. 1. on N.T. p. 134,] he mentions the people's joining in psalmody and the accustomed prayers. 'When ye have borne your part *in singing two or three psalms*, δύο ψαλμοὺς ἢ τρεῖς ὑπηχήσαντες, *and have made your usual prayers*, τὰς συνήθεις εὐχὰς ποιούμενοι, ye think ye have done enough for your salvation.' In the thirty-third Homily[96], p. 318, [387,] he notes the customary form of the minister's saying, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, *Peace be unto you all!* when he first enters the church: and he forms this exhortation upon it: 'When I say, Peace be unto you! and ye answer again, And with thy spirit! do not say this only in words, but in mind; not with your mouth, but with your heart. For if you say here in the church, Peace be with thy spirit! but as soon as you are gone out, begin to oppugn me, despise me, accuse me, and load me with a thousand reproaches, what peace is this?' In his sixty-ninth Homily[97], p. 600, [740,] speaking of the monks, and their manner of worshipping God, he says, 'As soon as they were out of their beds, they made a choir, and sang hymns to God, συμφώνως ἅπαντες ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος, *all together with one voice, and as it were with one mouth:* and among these, they particularly addressed that angelical hymn to God, Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good-will towards men!'

In his seventy-second Homily[98], p. 624, [768,] he speaks of

[95] Hom. 11. in Matth. (B. t. 7. p. 158 c. S. t. 2. p. 74. 34.) Ἀλλὰ ἂν δύο ψαλμοὺς ἢ τρεῖς ὑπηχήσαντες, τὰς καὶ συνήθεις εὐχὰς ἁπλῶς, καὶ, ὡς ἔτυχε, ποιούμενοι διαλυθῆτε, νομίζετε ἀρκεῖν τοῦτο εἰς σωτηρίαν ὑμῖν.

[96] Hom. 33. (B. 32. al. 33. ibid. p. 374 a. S. ibid. p. 222. 33.) Ὅταν εἴπω, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, εἶτα εἴπητε, Καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου, μὴ τῇ φωνῇ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ λέγετε· μὴ στόματι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ. Ἂν δὲ ἐνταῦθα μὲν λέγῃς, Εἰρήνη καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου· ἔξω δέ μοι πολεμῇς διαπτύων, καὶ κακηγορῶν, μυρίοις λάθρα πλύνων ὀνείδεσι, ποία εἰρήνη αὕτη;

[97] Hom. 69. (B. 68. al. 69. ibid. p. 674 c. S. ibid. p. 433. 20.) Ἀναστάντες τοίνυν εὐθέως ἀπὸ τῆς εὐνῆς φαιδροὶ, καὶ γεγηθότες, καὶ χορὸν ἕνα στησάμενοι, ἐν φαιδρῷ τῷ [προσώπῳ τε καὶ] συνειδότι, συμφώνως ἅπαντες, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος, ὕμνους εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων ᾄδουσι Θεὸν, γεραίροντες αὐτὸν, καὶ χάριν εἰδότες ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων αὐτῷ, τῶν τε ἰδίων, τῶν τε κοινῶν εὐεργετημάτων. . . . Τί τῶν ἀγγέλων οὗτος διέστηκεν ὁ χορὸς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ᾀδόντων καὶ λεγόντων. Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.

[98] Hom. 72. (B. 71. al. 72. t. 7. p. 699 e. S. t. 2. p. 451. 21.) Καὶ ἡ πρώτη δὲ δέησις ἐλέους γέμει, ὅταν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων παρακαλῶμεν· καὶ ἡ δευτέρα πάλιν, ὑπὲρ ἑτέρων, τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, πολὺ τὸ ἔλεος ἐπιζητοῦσα· καὶ ἡ τρίτη δὲ πάλιν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ

three prayers, one of which was for the demoniacs, the second for the penitents, and the third for the faithful or communicants, all conceived in a certain form of words; which is evident from this circumstance, which he there subjoins, 'that in the last of these prayers the children of the Church joined with the rest of the people in crying to God for mercy. The people prayed alone without the children, when they prayed for the demoniacs and penitents; but when they prayed for themselves, they strengthened their prayers with the cries and intercessions of their children, whose innocence and simplicity they esteemed to be prevailing motives with God to hear them.' By this account it is plain that these prayers must be in certain forms known both to the people and the children: otherwise it is impossible to imagine, how they should all join vocally in crying to God for mercy. In his twentieth Homily, which is upon the Lord's Prayer, he not only mentions the use of this form of prayer, but says, it was the peculiar privilege of communicants or baptized persons to use it. 'That this prayer,' says he [99], p. 200, [243,] 'belongs to the faithful only, is evidenced both from the laws of the Church, and the first words of the prayer itself. For no unbaptized person can call God his Father.' In the same Homily [1], [p. 250,] he takes notice of the ceremonies used in the reception of the eucharist, particularly the custom of giving one another the holy kiss of peace. And in the seventh Homily [2], p. 70, [85,] he alludes to the custom of the priest's saying, Ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, in the celebration of the eucharist, when he says, 'Christ gives holy things to holy men.'

8. The eighth tome of St. Chrysostom's works contains his Homilies on St. John and the Acts of the Apostles. In

In the eighth tome, on

αὕτη τὰ παιδία [τὰ ἄμωμα] τοῦ δήμου προβάλλεται, τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ ἔλεον παρακαλοῦντα. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτοὶ κατεγνώκαμεν ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα, ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν πολλὰ ἡμαρτηκότων, καὶ ἐγκληθῆναι ὀφειλόντων, αὐτοὶ βοῶμεν· ὑπὲρ δὲ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν οἱ παῖδες, ὧν τῆς ἁπλότητος τοὺς ζηλωτὰς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν μένει.

[99] Hom. 20. (B. 19. al. 20. ibid. p. 252 c. S. ibid. p. 139. 6.) Ὅτι γὰρ πιστοῖς αὕτη ἡ προσευχὴ προσήκει, καὶ οἱ νόμοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκουσι, καὶ τὸ προοίμιον τῆς εὐχῆς· ὁ γὰρ ἀμύητος οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο Πατέρα καλεῖν τὸν Θεόν.

[1] Ibid. (B. ibid. p. 257 a, b. S. ibid. p. 142. 14.) Πῶς οὖν ἀσπάσῃ τὸν ἀδελφόν; πῶς ἅψῃ τῆς θυσίας; πῶς ἀπογεύσῃ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ, τοσοῦτον ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς διανοίας τὸν ἰόν;

[2] Hom. 7. (B. ibid. p. 114 a. S. ibid. p. 48. 20.) Τὰ γὰρ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις δίδωσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἡμῖν παρέχει τῆς πηγῆς, ἀλλ' αἷμα ζῶν.

St. John and the Acts of the Apostles.

his preface to St. John[3] he mentions the form of renouncing the Devil, and covenanting with Christ. 'Ye which are initiated,' says he, [t. 2. on N. T. p. 7.] 'know what compact ye made with us, or rather with Christ, when he admitted you to his holy mystery, what you said to him concerning the pomp of Satan, how after you had renounced Satan and his angels, you renounced this also, and promised never to look toward it again.' In Homily forty-second[4], he speaks [p. 276,] of the Lord's Prayer, as 'a form of spiritual prayer which Christ taught his disciples and all Christians.' In Homily forty-fourth he says[5], [p. 288,] 'Every good Christian used this prayer daily, saying those holy words, Thy kingdom come! implying a belief of the resurrection.' In Homily sixty-first[6], [p. 401,] he makes mention of hymns and psalmody, as the honour of Christian funerals. In Homily seventy-seventh[7], he takes notice of the kiss of peace, and the common prayers made for the whole state of the world in the communion-service. 'We salute one another,' says he, [p. 500,] 'in the holy mysteries, that being many, we may be made one; and we make common prayers for those that are unbaptized, and supplications for the sick, and for the fruits of the world both by sea and land.' Which plainly refers to the known forms then commonly used in the Church.

In Homily nineteenth on the Acts of the Apostles[8] he

[3] Præf. in Ioan. (B. Hom. 1. t. 8. p. 6 c. S. t. 2. p. 558. 34.) Ἴστε δὲ οἱ μεμυημένοι, ποίας ἡμῖν ἔθεσθε συνθήκας· μᾶλλον δὲ, ποίας ἔθεσθε τῷ Χριστῷ, ὅτε ὑμᾶς αὐτὸς ἐμυσταγώγει· τί πρὸς αὐτὸν εἴπατε· τί περὶ τῆς πόμπης σατανικῆς αὐτῷ διελέχθητε· πῶς μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ καὶ ταύτῃ τότε ἀπετάττεσθε, καὶ ὑπισχνεῖσθε μηδὲ παρακύψειν ἐκεῖ.

[4] Hom. 42. (B. 43. al. 42. ibid. p. 257 b. S. ibid. p. 735. 29.) Διὸ χρὴ περὶ τούτων ἀεὶ τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα αἰτεῖν· τοιαῦτα γὰρ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς εὔχεσθαι ἐδίδαξεν· κἂν ἀναπτύξωμεν τὴν εὐχὴν ἐκείνην, οὐδὲν εὑρήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ σαρκικὸν, ἀλλὰ πάντα πνευματικά.

[5] Hom. 44. (B. 45. al. 44. ibid. p. 268 c. S. ibid. p. 743. 32.) Οὐδεὶς τῶν ὀρθῶς βεβιωκότων τῇ ἀναστάσει διαπιστεῖ, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑκάστην εὔχονται τὴν ἡμέραν, τὴν ῥῆσιν ἐκείνην τὴν ἁγίαν λέγοντες, Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.

[6] Hom. 61. (B. 62. al. 61. ibid. p. 374 e. S. ibid. p. 820. 2.) Ἡ γὰρ τιμὴ τῷ τετελευτηκότι, οὐ θρῆνοι καὶ οἰμωγαὶ, ἀλλ' ὕμνοι καὶ ψαλμῳδίαι, καὶ βίος ἄριστος.

[7] Hom. 77. (B. 78. al. 77. ibid. p. 464 d. S. ibid. p. 884. 6.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ἀσπαζόμεθα ἀλλήλους, ἵνα οἱ πολλοὶ γενώμεθα ἕν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμυήτων κοινὰς ποιούμεθα τὰς εὐχὰς, λιτανεύοντες ὑπὲρ νοσούντων, καὶ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ γῆς, καὶ θαλάττης.

[8] Hom. 19. in Act. Apost. (B. t. 9. p. 159 e. S. t. 4. p. 723. 41.) Κοινὸς [διάκονος *] ἕστηκεν ὁ διάκονος

* [Omitted by Savil as superfluous. Ed.]

speaks of several customary forms observed in the reading of the Scriptures: the deacon, the common minister of the Church, first stood up, and cried with a loud voice, [p. 185,] Πρόσχωμεν, *Let us give attention!* and this he repeated over and over again. After that the reader names the Prophet Esaias, or the like, and before he begins to read he cries out, Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, *Thus saith the Lord.*

In Homily twenty-first [9] he refers to the bidding prayer of the deacon, in which he was used to admonish the people in these words, among many other petitions, [p. 204,] 'Let us pray for those that sleep in Christ, and for those that make commemorations for them, for the Church, for the priests, for the people, for the martyrs, &c.'

In Homily twenty-fourth [10] he mentions the hymns that were used by all in common at the communion-table, [p. 229,] 'Know you not that you then stand with angels, and sing with them, and send up hymns and praises to God with them?' meaning the trisagion, or cherubical hymn, Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God of Hosts, &c! which was a known part of the eucharistical service.

9. The ninth tome of his works contains his homilies on the Epistle to the Romans, and the first and second to the Corinthians.

In the ninth tome, on Romans, and the first and second to the Corinthians.

In his seventh Homily on Romans [11], p. 68, [t. 4. on N. T. p. 84,] he speaks of common prayer sent up to God with one voice for the energumens, or persons vexed with evil spirits. Which was by a certain form, as we have seen before in his seventy-first Homily on St. Matthew, and is evident from the very manner of expressing it here: for the people could not pray with one voice, unless a form of words was some way or other dictated to them. This dictating of prayers to be used by the whole

μέγα βοῶν καὶ λέγων, Πρόσχωμεν· καὶ τοῦτο πολλάκις· ἐκείνη ἡ φωνὴ, κοινὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐστὶν, ἣν οὕτως ἀφίησι. . . . . Μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἄρχεται ὁ ἀναγνώστης τῆς προφητείας Ἡσαΐου . . . . εἶτα εἰς ἐπήκοον ἐκφωνεῖ λέγων, Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, κ. τ. λ.

[9] Hom. 21. (B. ibid. p. 176 a. S. ibid. p. 735. 39.) *Οὐχ ἁπλῶς ὁ διάκονος βοᾷ, Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων, καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων, κ. τ. λ.*

[10] Hom. 24. (B. ibid. p. 199 c. S. ibid. p. 753. 39.) *Οὐκ οἶδας, ὅτι μετὰ ἀγγέλων ἕστηκας; μετ' ἐκείνων ᾄδεις, μετ' ἐκείνων ὑμνεῖς, κ. τ. λ.*

[11] Hom. 7. in Ep. ad Rom. (B. ibid. p. 490 e. S. t. 3. p. 70. 17.) *Κοινῇ πάντες εὐξώμεθα, καὶ μίαν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνενέγκωμεν φωνὴν, ὡς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων.*

assembly was commonly the office of the deacon, as Chrysostom informs us in the fourteenth Homily upon this same Epistle, p. 165, [201,] where he shows the different state of the Church in the Apostles' days from that of his own time. For explaining those words, (Rom. 8, 26.) "The Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered," he says[12], 'This was an obscure expression, because many of the miraculous gifts which were then in being were since ceased: as the gift of prophecy, the gift of wisdom, the gift of healing the sick, the gift of raising the dead, the gift of tongues, and among the rest the gift of prayer, which was then distinguished by the name of *the spirit:* and he that had this gift prayed for the whole congregation. Upon which account the Apostle gives the name of *the spirit* both to this gift, and to the soul that was endowed with it, who made intercession with groanings unto God, asking of God such things as were of general use and advantage to the whole congregation: the image or symbol of which is now the deacon, who offers up prayers for the people.' Here, according to Chrysostom, *the spirit of praying* was an extraordinary gift, like that of tongues; and the difference between the apostolical age and his own was this, that at first both the matter and words of their prayers were inspired in an extraordinary way, but afterward the deacons prayed by ordinary forms, without any such immediate inspiration.

[12] Hom. 14. (B. ibid. p. 585 e. S. ibid. p. 120. 27.) Ἀσαφὲς τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τὸ πολλὰ τῶν τότε γινομένων θαυμάτων πεπαῦσθαι νῦν· διόπερ ἀναγκαῖον διδάξαι ὑμᾶς τὴν τότε κατάστασιν, καὶ οὕτω σαφέστερος λοιπὸν ἔσται ὁ λόγος. Τίς οὖν ἡ τότε κατάστασις ἦν; Διάφορα πᾶσι τοῖς τότε βαπτιζομένοις ἐδίδου χαρίσματα ὁ Θεὸς, ἃ δὴ καὶ πνεύματα ἐκαλεῖτο· πνεύματα γὰρ προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεταί, φησι· καὶ ὁ μὲν, ἔχει προφητείας χάρισμα, προέλεγε τὰ μέλλοντα· ὁ δὲ σοφίας, καὶ ἐδίδασκε τοὺς πολλούς· ὁ δὲ ἰαμάτων, καὶ ἐθεράπευε τοὺς νοσοῦντας· ὁ δὲ δυνάμεων, καὶ ἤγειρε τοὺς νεκρούς· ὁ δὲ γλωσσῶν, καὶ διαφόροις ἐλάλει φωναῖς. Μετὰ δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων ἦν καὶ εὐχῆς χάρισμα, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐλέγετο· καὶ ὁ τοῦτο ἔχων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλήθους παντὸς ηὔχετο· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ, πολλὰ τῶν συμφερόντων ἡμῖν ἀγνοοῦντες, τὰ μὴ συμφέροντα αἰτοῦμεν, ἤρχετο χάρισμα εὐχῆς εἰς ἕνα τινὰ τῶν τότε, καὶ τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἁπάσης, αὐτός τε ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων ἵστατο αἰτῶν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαίδευε. Πνεῦμα τοίνυν ἐνταῦθα καλεῖ τότε χάρισμα τὸ τοιοῦτον, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν δεχομένην τὸ χάρισμα, καὶ ἐντυγχάνουσαν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ στενάζουσαν. Ὁ γὰρ τοιαύτης καταξιωθεὶς χάριτος, ἐστὼς μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς κατανύξεως, μετὰ πολλῶν τῶν στεναγμῶν τῶν κατὰ διάνοιαν τῷ Θεῷ προσπιπτόντων, τὰ συμφέροντα πᾶσιν αἰτεῖ· οὗ καὶ νῦν σύμβολόν ἐστιν ὁ διάκονος, τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου ἀναφέρων εὐχάς.

In his Comments upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians, Homily twenty-fourth [13], p. 532, [156,] he rehearses the heads of the solemn thanksgiving at the consecration of the eucharist. 'We rehearse,' says he, 'over the cup the ineffable blessings of God, and whatever benefits we enjoy; and so we offer it at the holy table, and communicate, giving him thanks that he hath delivered mankind from error; that when we were afar off, he hath made us near; that when we had no hope, and were without God, he hath made us brethren and fellow-heirs with himself; for these and all the like blessings we give him thanks, and so come to his holy table.' In Homily thirty-five [14], p. 640, [389,] he notes the words, *Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, for ever and ever*, to be the common conclusion of their eucharistical thanksgivings, to which a layman, if they were said in an unknown tongue, could not answer Amen! In Homily thirty-sixth [15], p. 652, [405,] he mentions the form, Peace be with you all! to which the people answered, And with thy spirit! which he derives from apostolical practice, when both minister and people were used to speak by immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. He further observes [16], p. 653, [405,] that they all sang in common, both in the Apostles' days and in his own time: and that the bishop at the entrance into the church said always, Peace be to you all! as a proper salutation when he came into his Father's house; though he laments, 'that whilst they retained the name of peace, they had lost the thing.' Again [17], p. 655, [408,] he takes notice, that when a single reader

[13] Hom. 24. in 1 Cor. (B. t. 10. p. 212 d. S. t. 3. p. 396. 32.) *Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπιλέγοντες τῷ ποτηρίῳ τὰς ἀφάτους εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅσων ἀπολελαύκαμεν, οὕτως αὐτὸ προσάγομεν καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν, εὐχαριστοῦντες, ὅτι τῆς πλάνης ἀπήλλαξε τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· ὅτι μακρὰν ὄντας ἐγγὺς ἐποίησεν· ὅτι ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντας, καὶ ἀθέους ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀδελφοὺς ἑαυτοῦ κατεσκεύασε καὶ συγκληρονόμους· ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἁπάντων εὐχαριστοῦντες, οὕτω πρόσιμεν.*

[14] Hom. 35. (B. ibid. p. 325 e. S. ibid. p. 477. 19.) *Ἂν εὐλογήσεις τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων φωνῇ, οὐκ εἰδὼς τί λέγεις, οὐδὲ ἑρμηνεῦσαι δυνάμενος, οὐ δύναται ὑποφωνῆσαι τὸ Ἀμὴν ὁ λαϊκός· οὐ γὰρ ἀκούων τὸ, Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τέλος, οὐ λέγει τὸ Ἀμήν.*

[15] Hom. 36. (B. ibid. p. 339 d. S. ibid. p. 487. 4.) *Διὸ ἐπειδὰν ἀρξώμεθα λέγειν, ὁ λαὸς ἀντιφθέγγεται, Τῷ πνεύματί σου, δεικνὺς, ὅτι τὸ παλαιὸν οὕτως ἔλεγον οὐκ οἰκείᾳ σοφίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ Πνεύματι κινούμενοι.*

[16] Ibid. (B. p. 340 b. S. p. ead. 24.) *Συνῄεσαν τὸ παλαιὸν ἅπαντες, καὶ ὑπέψαλλον* [al. *ἐπέψαλλον*] *κοινῇ· τοῦτο ποιοῦμεν καὶ νῦν. . . . . Εἰρήνην καὶ νῦν πᾶσιν ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστὼς ἐπεύχεται, ὡς εἰς πατρῴαν οἰκίαν εἰσιών· ἀλλὰ τῆς εἰρήνης ταύτης τὸ μὲν ὄνομα πολὺ, τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα οὐδαμοῦ.*

[17] Ibid. (B. p. 342 d. S. p. 489. 5.)

sung the Psalms, all the people, as it were with one mouth, did ὑπηκεῖν, *return their answer* to him, that is, either by singing the verses alternately, or by joining in the close of every verse; of which more in the first chapter of the next Book.

In the fortieth Homily[18], p. 688, [452,] he observes, that every person at his baptism was, by the rule of the Church, obliged to make profession of his faith in the solemn words of the Creed; and among other articles particularly said, 'I believe the resurrection of the dead:' by which form of profession Chrysostom explains that noted passage of St. Paul, (1 Cor. 15, 29,) "Why are they then baptized for the dead?" 'That is, if the dead rise not, why do they profess at their baptism that they believe the resurrection of the dead?' In the forty-first Homily[19], p. 702, [468,] he mentions part of the solemn form of prayer for the dead then in use in the Church. 'It is not without reason', says he, 'that he, that stands at the altar when the holy mysteries are celebrated, says, We offer for all those who are dead in Christ, and for all those who make commemorations for them.' And a little after[20], 'We at that time also make prayers for the whole world, and name the dead with martyrs, and confessors, and priests: for we are all one body, though some members exceed other members in glory.'

In his second Homily upon the second Epistle to the Corinthians[21], p. 740, [516,] he styles the Lord's Prayer εὐχὴν νενομισμένην, *the prayer* which Christ brought in, and *established by law* in his Church; and says, it was the peculiar privilege of the faithful to use it, for the catechumens were not allowed so

Καὶ ὁ ψάλλων, ψάλλει μόνος· κἂν πάντες ὑπηχῶσιν, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος ἡ φωνὴ φέρεται.

[18] Hom. 40. (B. ibid. p. 380 c. S. ibid. p. 515. 18.) .... Πρότερον εἰπὼν ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν, τότε ὁμολογεῖς καὶ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. .... Τούτων τοίνυν τῶν ῥημάτων ἀναμιμνήσκων ὁ Παῦλός φησι, Τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ γὰρ μή ἐστιν ἀνάστασίς, φησι, σκηνὴ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα· εἰ μή ἐστιν ἀνάστασις, πῶς αὐτοὺς πείθομεν πιστεύειν, ἅπερ οὐ διδόαμεν.

[19] Hom. 41. (B. ibid. p. 392 e. S. ibid. p. 524. 22.) Οὐδὲ μάτην ὑπαρεστὼς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων τελουμένων, βοᾷ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων, καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελούντων, κ. τ. λ.

[20] Ibid. (B. p. 393 b. S. p. ead. 32.) Διὰ τοῦτο θαρροῦντες ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης δεόμεθα τότε, καὶ μετὰ μυρτύρων αὐτοὺς καλοῦμεν, μετὰ ὁμολογητῶν, μετὰ ἱερέων· καὶ γὰρ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἅπαντες, κἂν λαμπρότερα μέλη μελῶν.

[21] Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. (B. ibid. p. 435 c. S. ibid. p. 553. 21.) Οὐδέπω γὰρ εὐχὴν ἔχουσι τὴν νενομισμένην καὶ εἰσενεχθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὐδέπω παρρησίαν κέκτηνται.

great a favour before baptism. There also he mentions several forms of the deacon's calling upon the people to pray; as that, Στῶμεν καλῶς, δεηθῶμεν, *Let us stand devoutly, and pray!* which, he says, was addressed not only to the priests, but also to the people: and again, Let us pray ardently for the catechumens! after which admonition the deacon recited the particular petitions they were to make for them, which Chrysostom there relates at length in the very form that was used, which I shall omit to recite here, because the reader may find it whole hereafter[22] in the Service of the Catechumens. A little after in this same Homily[23], p. 743, [520,] he mentions the usual form of renunciation in baptism: 'Ye that are initiated,' says he, 'know what I say: for ye easily remember those words, whereby ye renounce the tyranny of the Devil, falling upon your knees, and going over to Christ your King, and uttering those tremendous words, whereby we are taught to pay no manner of obedience to the tyrant.' And, p. 745, [521,] he adds[24], 'that in the service of the faithful, that is, the communion-service, the deacon again bids them supplicate and address God for bishops, for presbyters, for kings, for emperors, for all by sea and land, for the temperature of the air, and for the whole world.' Which are but so many hints of the deacon's bidding prayer in the Service of the Faithful, more fully related in the first chapter of the fifteenth Book.

In the fifth Homily[25], p. 775, [557,] he speaks of the obligation men have to use the Lord's Prayer. In the eighteenth Homily[26], p. 872, [673,] he intimates a form of prayer used by the people at the time of ordaining ministers. 'The suffrage of the people,'

[22] See b. 14. ch. 5. next vol.

[23] Ibid. (B. p. 438 d. S. p. 555. 26.) Καὶ ἴστε ταῦτα οἱ μεμυημένοι· ἀναμνήσθητε γοῦν τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, δι' ὧν ἀπετάξασθε αὐτοῦ τῇ τυραννίδι, γόνυ κλίναντες, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα αὐτομολήσαντες, καὶ τὰ φρικώδη ἐκεῖνα φθεγξάμενοι ῥήματα, δι' ὧν παιδευόμεθα μηδὲν αὐτῷ καθόλου πείθεσθαι.

[24] Ibid. (B. p. 440 e. S. p. 557. 6.) Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν πιστῶν, ὑπὲρ ἐπισκόπων, ὑπὲρ πρεσβυτέρων, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, ὑπὲρ τῶν κρατούντων, ὑπὲρ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, ὑπὲρ ἀέρων, ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης κελευόμεθα προσιέναι τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ.

[25] Hom. 5. (B. ibid. p. 471 c. S. ibid. p. 578. 5.) Τοῦτο καὶ ἐπετάγης λέγειν, Ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

[26] Hom. 18. (B. ibid. p. 568 a. S. ibid. p. 646. 42.) Ἡ τούτων ψῆφος, οὐχ, ὡς ἔτυχε, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς πνευματικὰς ἀρχὰς ἐρχομένους κατακοσμεῖ. Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μέλλων χειροτονεῖν, καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων εὐχὰς καλεῖ τότε, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιψηφίζονται, καὶ ἐπιβοῶσιν ἅπερ ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι· οὐ γὰρ δὴ θέμις ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμνήτων ἐκκαλύπτειν ἅπαντα.

says he, 'is no little ornament to those who are called to any spiritual dignity. And therefore he that performs the office of ordination then requires their prayers, and they join their suffrage, and cry out those words, which they that are initiated know, for it is not lawful to speak all things before the unbaptized.' A little after[27], p. 873, [673,] he says, 'The people had a considerable share in the prayers of the Church. For common prayers were made both by priest and people for the energumens and penitents, and they all say one and the same prayer for them, the prayer is so full of mercy.' Again[28], 'When we dismiss those who may not participate of the holy table, another prayer is to be made, in which we all fall down upon the ground together, and all rise together.' He means the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, which was said jointly by the priest and people together. Again[29], 'When the salutation of peace is mutually to be given and received, we all in like manner use this salutation.' He means either the kiss of peace, or the form of salutation used between priest and people, The peace of God be with you! And with thy spirit! But more probably he means the former, because it immediately follows after[30], 'When we come to the tremendous mysteries, then as the priest prays for the people, so the people pray for the priest. For these words, And with thy spirit! signify nothing else.' Again[31], 'That prayer wherein we give thanks, is common to both. For not only the priest gives thanks, but all the people. For he first receives their answer, they rejoining, It is meet and right so to do! and then he begins the thanksgiving. And

[27] Ibid. (B. p. ead. b. S. ibid. p. 647. 6.) Καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς δὲ πολὺ τὸν λαὸν ἴδοι τις ἂν συνεισφέροντα· καὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, κοιναὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν γίνονται αἱ εὐχαί· καὶ πάντες μίαν λέγουσιν εὐχὴν, εὐχὴν τὴν ἐλέου γέμουσαν. Πάλιν, ἐπειδὰν εἴρξομεν τῶν ἱερῶν περιβόλων τοὺς οὐ δυναμένους τῆς ἱερᾶς μετασχεῖν τραπέζης, ἑτέραν δεῖ γενέσθαι εὐχὴν, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμεθα, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἀνιστάμεθα, ὅταν εἰρήνης πάλιν μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ μεταδιδόναι δέῃ, πάντες ὁμοίως ἀσπαζόμεθα. Ἐπ' αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν φρικωδεστάτων μυστηρίων ἐπεύχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ λαῷ, ἐπεύχεται καὶ ὁ λαὸς τῷ ἱερεῖ· τὸ γὰρ Μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, οὐδὲν ἄλλό ἐστιν, ἢ τοῦτο. Τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας πάλιν κοινά· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος εὐχαριστεῖ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἅπας· πρότερον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαβὼν φωνὴν, εἶτα συντιθεμένων, ὅτι ἀξίως καὶ δικαίως τοῦτο γίνεται, τότε ἄρχεται τῆς εὐχαριστίας. Καὶ τί θαυμάζεις, εἴ που μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ λαὸς φθέγγεται, ὅπουγε καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν τῶν Χερουβὶμ, καὶ τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων, κοινῇ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἐκείνους ὕμνους ἀναπέμπει.

[28] See the preceding note.

[29] See the same, further on.

[30] See the same, near the end.

[31] See the same, nearer the end.

why should any man wonder that the people should speak together with the priest, when they even join with Cherubims and the powers above to send up in common those sacred hymns to heaven?' Meaning the hymns, Holy! Holy! Holy! and Glory be to God on high! which were sung by all the people in the communion-service. Chrysostom has a good remark upon all these forms, and the people's obligation to bear a part in them, which therefore I may not here omit, because it shows us the reason why the ancient Church so ordered her service. 'I have mentioned all these things,' says he[32], 'on purpose to excite the vigilance of those that are in an inferior station, that we may learn that we are all one body, and only differ as one member may differ from another; and that we should not cast all upon the priests, but ourselves be concerned in the care of the whole Church as of one common body.'

10. The last tome of St. Chrysostom's works contains his Homilies upon the remaining Epistles of St. Paul. In the tenth tome.

In his first Homily on the Ephesians[33], p. 1037, [t. 5. on N. T. p. 869,] he speaks of the forms of profession used in baptism: 'What is more gracious,' says he, 'than those words, by which we renounce the Devil? by which we covenant with Christ? What more gracious than that profession, which we make both before and after baptism?' In the third Homily[34], p. 1051, [888,] he tells us the deacons were wont to use this form of words to all those that were under the Church's censures, to withdraw from the Lord's table, 'Ye that are in the state of penance, depart.' And[35], p. 1052, [888,] when they were gone, they said again to the communicants, 'Let us pray in common all together.' And there also he speaks of the hymns[36] that were sung at the Lord's table. In

[32] Ibid. (B. p. ead. d. S. p. ead. 18.) *Ταῦτα δέ μοι πάντα ἐκεῖνα εἴρηται, ἵνα ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων νήφῃ, ἵνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι σῶμά ἐσμεν ἅπαντες ἓν, τοσαύτην ἔχοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰν, ὅσην μέλη πρὸς μέλη· καὶ μὴ τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερέας ῥίπτωμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ, ὥσπερ κοινοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἁπάσης οὕτω φροντίζωμεν.*

[33] Hom. 1. in Ephes. (B. t. 11. p. 6 e. S. t. 3. p. 767. 33.) *Τί χαριέστερον τῶν ῥημάτων, δι' ὧν ἀποτασσόμεθα τῷ Διαβόλῳ; δι' ὧν συντασσόμεθα τῷ Χριστῷ; τῆς ὁμολογίας ἐκείνης τῆς πρὸ τοῦ λουτροῦ; τῆς μετὰ τὸ λουτρόν;*

[34] Hom. 3. (B. ibid. p. 23 a. S. ibid. p. 778. 26.) *Ἀκούεις ἑστῶτος τοῦ κήρυκος καὶ λέγοντος, Ὅσοι ἐν μετανοίᾳ, ἀπέλθετε πάντες.*

[35] Ibid. (B. p. ead. d. S. p. ead. 41.) .. *Ὅταν ἀκούσῃς, Δεηθῶμεν πάντες κοινῇ, κ. τ. λ.*

[36] Ibid. (B. p. ead. e. S. p. 779. 2.) *Οὕτω δὴ καὶ σὺ παραγέγονας· τὸν*

the fourteenth Homily[37], p. 1127, [981,] he argues from the use of the Lord's Prayer, that men should not revile those whom they therein owned to be their brethren. 'If he is not thy brother, how dost thou say *Our Father?* for that word *our* denotes many persons.' And further, to show the indecency of such contumelious language, he reminds them of their known custom in singing the sacred hymns with Cherubims and Seraphims at the communion[38]. 'Consider with whom you stand in the time of the holy mysteries. With Cherubims, with Seraphims. For the Seraphims use no reviling. Their mouth is continually employed in fulfilling one necessary office, that of glorifying and praising God. How then can you say with them, Holy! Holy! Holy! who use your mouth to revile your brethren?' He adds[39], 'You say *Our Father!* and what follows that? *Which art in heaven.* As soon as you say *Our Father which art in heaven*, that word raises you up, and gives wings to your soul, and shows that you have a Father in heaven. Therefore do nothing, say nothing of those things that are upon earth. You stand in heaven, and do you use reviling? You converse with angels, and do you use reviling? You are honoured with the kiss of the Lord, and do you use reviling? God adorns your mouth so many ways with angelical hymns, with meat, not angelical, but above angels, with his own kisses and embraces, and do you still accustom yourself to reviling?' In the twenty-third Homily[40], p. 1190, [1061,] he says, 'Jesus,

ὕμνον ᾖσας, μετὰ πάντων, κ. τ. λ. . . . Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τῶν προκειμένων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν ᾠδῶν ἐκείνων τὸ Πνεῦμα πάντοθεν κάτεισιν.

[37] Hom. 14. (B. ibid. p. 108 a. S. ibid. p. 837. 28.) Εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδελφὸς, πῶς λέγεις Πάτερ ἡμῶν; τὸ γὰρ ἡμῶν, πολλῶν ἐστι προσώπων σημαντικόν.

[38] Ibid. (B. p. ead. S. p. ead. 29.) Ἐννόησον μετὰ τίνων ἕστηκας κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῶν μυστηρίων, μετὰ τῶν Χερουβὶμ, μετὰ τῶν Σεραφίμ. Τὰ Σεραφὶμ οὐχ ὑβρίζει, ἀλλὰ μίαν αὐτοῖς χρείαν μόνον τὸ στόμα πληροῖ, τὸ δοξολογεῖν, τὸ δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν. Πῶς οὖν δυνήσῃ σὺ μετ' ἐκείνων λέγειν, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, εἰς ὕβριν τῷ στόματι κεχρημένος;

[39] Ibid. (B. p. ead. b. S. p. ead. 36.) Πάτερ ἡμῶν· καὶ τί; τοῦτο μόνον; ἄκουε καὶ τῶν ἑξῆς· Ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· εὐθέως εἶπες, Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ἀνέστησέ σε τὸ ῥῆμα, ἐπτέρωσέ σου τὴν διάνοιαν, ἔδειξεν, ὅτι Πατέρα ἔχεις ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Μηδὲν πράττε, μηδὲν λέγε τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς. Εἰς ἐκείνην σε τὴν τάξιν ἔστησε τὴν ἄνω, ἐκείνῳ σε ἐνέκρινε τῷ χορῷ· τί σαυτὸν κάτω καθέλκεις; Παρὰ τὸν θρόνον ἕστηκας τὸν βασιλικὸν, καὶ ὑβρίζεις; . . Ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἕστηκας, καὶ ὑβρίζεις; μετὰ ἀγγέλων πολιτεύῃ, καὶ ὑβρίζεις; φιλήματος ἠξίωσαι δεσποτικοῦ, καὶ ὑβρίζεις; τοσούτοις σου τὸ στόμα ἐκόσμησεν ὁ Θεὸς, ὕμνοις ἀγγελικοῖς, τροφῇ οὐκέτι ἀγγελικῇ, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἀγγελικὴν, φιλήματι τῷ αὐτοῦ, περιπλοκαῖς ταῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ὑβρίζεις;

[40] Hom. 23. (B. ibid. p. 178 a. S. ibid. p. 886. 22.) Ἀλλ' ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

the Son of the living God, hath brought down to us the celestial hymns. For what the Cherubims say above, he hath commanded us to say, Holy! Holy! Holy!'

On the Philippians, in the fifteenth Homily[41], p. 1315, [t. 6. on N. T. p. 141,] he positively asserts, 'that Christ delivered the Lord's Prayer as *a form of prayer*, ὅρον εὐχῆς, teaching us to say, Give us this day our daily bread.'

On the Colossians, in the third Homily[42], p. 1337, [173,] 'We pray, saying, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven! We give thanks, saying[43], Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men! We petition in our prayers for the angel of peace, and we pray for peace upon all occasions, for nothing can be compared unto it. The bishop in the church gives the benediction of peace, saying in every office, in prayers, in supplications, in his Homilies, once, twice, thrice, and oftener, Peace be with you all!' Again[44], p. 1338, [173,] 'When the bishop enters the church, he immediately says, Peace be with you all! When he preaches, Peace be with you all! When he gives the blessing, Peace be with you all! When he bids you salute one another, Peace be with you all! When the sacrifice is offered, Peace be with you all: and in the intervals, Grace and Peace be with you! Is it not therefore absurd, that when we so often hear *peace* mentioned, we should still be at

ὁ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, ὁ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, ἤνεγκε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀρετὴν, πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖθεν καρποὺς ἡμῖν κατήνεγκεν, τοὺς ὕμνους λέγω τοὺς ἐπουρανίους· ἃ γὰρ τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἄνω λέγει, ταῦτα καὶ ἡμῖν προσέταξε λέγειν, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος.

41 Hom. 15. in Ep. ad Philipp. (B. ibid. 316 a. S. t. 4. p. 86. 8.) Ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὅρον εὐχῆς ἡμῖν διδοὺς, τοῦτο τῇ εὐχῇ ἐνέθηκε, διδάσκων ἡμᾶς, Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, λέγειν, Δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.

42 Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Coloss. (B. ibid. p. 346 d. S. ibid. p. 105. 34.) Καὶ πῶς εὐχόμεθα λέγοντες, Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κ. τ. λ.

43 Ibid. (B. ibid. p. 347 b. S. ibid. p. 106. 9.) Διὰ τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦντες λέγομεν, Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. ... Διὰ τοῦτο εὐχόμεθα, καὶ λέγομεν αἰτοῦντες τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς εἰρήνης· καὶ πανταχοῦ εἰρήνην αἰτοῦμεν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ταύτης ἴσον· ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις εἰρήνην, ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἐν ταῖς λιταῖς, ἐν ταῖς προσρήσεσι· καὶ ἅπαξ, καὶ δὶς, καὶ τρὶς, καὶ πολλάκις αὐτὴν δίδωσιν ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστὼς, Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, ἐπιλέγων.

44 Ibid. (B. p. 348 c. S. p. 107. 2.) Ὅταν εἰσέλθῃ ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστὼς, εὐθέως λέγει, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ὁμιλῇ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν εὐλογῇ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ἀσπάζεσθαι κελεύῃ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ἡ θυσία τελεσθῇ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσι· καὶ μεταξὺ πάλιν, Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον, εἰ τοσαυτάκις ἀκούοντες εἰρήνην ἔχειν, ἐκπεπολεμώμεθα πρὸς ἀλλήλους; καὶ λαμβάνοντες, καὶ ἀντιδιδόντες, τῷ διδόντι τὴν εἰρήνην πολεμοῦμεν; Λέγεις, Καὶ τῷ πνεύματί σου, καὶ διαβάλλεις αὐτὸν ἔξω.

war among ourselves? We receive the salutation of peace, and return it to him that gives it, and yet are at war with him. You answer, And with thy spirit! yet, as soon as you are gone out of the church, you calumniate and revile him.' He adds[45], p. 1339, [173,] 'that it was not the bishop, properly speaking, that gave the peace, but Christ, that vouchsafes to speak by his mouth.' In Homily sixth, on Colossians[46], p. 1358, [200,] he compares the forms of renunciation in baptism, and covenanting with Christ, to an handwriting or bond, saying, 'Let us beware that we be not convicted by it, after we have said those words, We renounce thee, Satan, and we make a covenant with thee, O Christ.' Again[47], p. 1359, [201,] 'You are taught to say, I renounce thee, and thy pomp, and thy worship, and thy angels.' He adds, 'that every new-baptized person, as soon as he came up out of the water, was appointed to say, Our Father which art in heaven, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.' In the ninth Homily, on Colossians[48], p. 1380, [228,] on those words "Admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," (3, 16.) he says, 'The faithful know what is the hymn of the spirits above; what the Cherubims above say; what the angels said, Glory be to God on high!' Meaning that these two hymns were sung by the faithful in the communion-service. In the tenth Homily[49], p. 1385, [233,] he gives the Lord's Prayer the title of εὐχὴ πιστῶν, *the prayer of the faithful*, because it was their peculiar privilege to use it.

In the third Homily[50], on 2 Thess., p. 1502, [381,] he men-

[45] Ibid. (B. p. ead. f. S. p. ead. 14.) Μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ δίδωμι τὴν εἰρήνην; ὁ Χριστὸς δι' ἡμῶν φθέγγεσθαι καταξιῶν.

[46] Hom. 6. (B. ibid. p. 369 c. S. ibid. p. 121. 28.) Ἀλλὰ γέγονεν ἕτερον χειρόγραφον πάλιν, οὐ τοιοῦτον, οἷον τὸ πρότερον. Ὁρᾶτε οὖν, μὴ τούτῳ ἁλῶμεν, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν, Ἀποτάσσομεν τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ συντάσσομέν σοι, Χριστέ· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἂν κληθῇ τοῦτο χειρόγραφον, ἀλλὰ συνθήκη, κ. τ. λ.

[47] Ibid. (B. p. 370 b. S. p. 122. 11.)...Εὐθέως διδάσκῃ λέγειν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι ...καὶ τῇ πομπῇ σου, καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σου, καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις σου· .... εὐθέως γὰρ ἀνελθὼν ταῦτα φθέγγεται τὰ ῥήματα· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου.

[48] Hom. 9. (B. ibid. p. 393 d. S. ibid. p. 138. 32.) Τίς ὁ ὕμνος τῶν ἄνω, τί λέγει τὰ Χερουβὶμ, ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοί· τί ἔλεγον οἱ ἄγγελοι κάτω; Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ.

[49] Hom. 10. (B. ibid. p. 399 b. S. ibid. p. 142. 41.) Εἶτα ἐπιθεὶς τὴν εὐχὴν τῶν πιστῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[50] Hom. 3. in 2 Thess. (B. ibid. p. 527 e. S. ibid. p. 234. 2.) Ὅταν γὰρ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀναγινώσκων λέγῃ, Τάδε λέγει Κύριος· καὶ ὁ διάκονος ἑστὼς ἐπιστομίζῃ πάντας, οὐ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι τιμὴν ποιῶν τοῦτό φησιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ δι' ἐκείνου πᾶσι διαλεγομένῳ.

tions two usual forms relating to the reading of the lessons in the church. 'When the reader rises up, and says, Thus saith the Lord! and the deacon standing up commands all men to keep silence, he does not say this to honour the reader, but God who speaks to all by him.'

In the sixth Homily, on 1 Tim.[51], p. 1553, [444,] he proves that infidels are prayed for as well as others, from the use of the Lord's Prayer. 'For when he that prays says, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven! the meaning is, that as there is no infidel in heaven, so we pray that there may be none on earth neither.'

In the second Homily, on 2 Tim.[52], p. 1638, [552,] he says, 'The words, whereby the priests consecrate the eucharist were the same that Christ spake.'

In the fourth Homily, on Hebrews[53], p. 1785, [736,] he intimates, that they had set psalms in their funeral-service. 'Consider,' says he, 'what you sing at that time, Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee. And again, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me. And again, Thou art my refuge from tribulation, which compasses me about! Consider what those psalms mean. You say, Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul! and do you still weep? Is not this mere pageantry and hypocrisy? if you believe the things to be true, which you

[51] Hom. 6. in 1 Tim. (B. ibid. p. 581 f. S. ibid. p. 273. 39.) Ἀλλ' οὐκ εἴρηται, φησιν, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπίστων εὔχεσθαι ἐκεῖ· ἐπειδὴ μηδὲ ἴστε τῆς εὐχῆς τὴν δύναμιν, μηδὲ τὸ βάθος καὶ τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτῆς ἐπιγινώσκετε. Εἰ γάρ τις αὐτὴν ἀναπτύξει [Savil. ἀναπτύξειεν], εὑρήσει καὶ τοῦτο κείμενον ἐν αὐτῇ· ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ ὁ εὐχόμενος, Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ τοῦτο αἰνίττεται. Πῶς; ὅτι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδεὶς ἄπιστος, οὐδεὶς προσκρούων. Εἰ τοίνυν περὶ τῶν πιστῶν μόνον ἦν, οὐκ εἶχε λόγον τὸ λεγόμενον· εἰ γὰρ οἱ πιστοὶ ἔμελλον τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, οἱ δὲ ἄπιστοι οὐχί, οὐκέτι, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἦν. Ἀλλὰ τί; ὥσπερ ἐν οὐρανῷ, φησιν, οὐδεὶς πονηρὸς, οὕτω μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔστω.

[52] Hom. 2. in 2 Tim. (B. ibid. p. 671 e. S. ibid. p. 339. 6.) Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ῥήματα, ἅπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφθέγξατο, τὰ αὐτά ἐστι, ἅπερ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ νῦν λέγει, οὕτω καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι.

[53] Hom. 4. in Hebr. (B. t. 12. p. 47 b. S. ibid. p. 454. 8.) Ἐννόησον τί ψάλλεις κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον· Ἐπίστρεψον, ψυχή μου, εἰς τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου, ὅτι Κύριος εὐηργέτησέ σε· καὶ πάλιν, Οὐ φοβηθήσομαι κακὰ, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ· καὶ πάλιν, Σύ μου καταφυγὴ ἀπὸ θλίψεως τῆς περιεχούσης με. Ἐννόησον τί βούλονται οὗτοι οἱ ψαλμοί· ἀλλ' οὐ προσέχεις, ἀλλὰ μεθύεις ὑπὸ τοῦ πένθους· κἂν ἐν τοῖς ἑτέρων κηδεύμασι κατανόησον ἀκριβῶς, ἵνα ἔχῃς φάρμακον ἐν τοῖς σοῖς. Ἐπίστρεψον, ψυχή μου, εἰς τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου, ὅτι Κύριος εὐηργέτησέ σε, λέγεις, καὶ δακρύεις; οὐχὶ σκηνὴ ταῦτά ἐστιν, οὐχ ὑπόκρισις; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὄντως πιστεύεις οἷς λέγεις, περιττῶς πενθεῖς.

say, it is superfluous to lament.' In the fourteenth Homily[54], p. 1852, [821,] speaking of the hymns sung at the eucharist, he says, 'Do not we sing the same celestial hymns, which the choirs of incorporeal powers sing above?' In the seventeenth Homily[55], p. 1870, [844,] he mentions a part of the oblation-prayer. 'In the oblation we offer, or bear and confess our sins, and say, Forgive us our transgressions, whether voluntary or involuntary: that is, we first remember them, and then ask pardon.' There also[56], p. 1872, [844,] he mentions the deacon's solemn form of words, admonishing the people to come holy to the holy sacrament: 'For this reason the deacon cries out and calls upon the saints, and by these words prompts all men to consider their offences, that no one come unprepared.'

In the twenty-second Homily[57], p. 1898, [880,] he tacitly refers to the form, *Sursum corda! Let us lift up our hearts!* For having mentioned those words of the Psalmist, (141, 2.) "Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice," he adds, 'With our hands let us also lift up our hearts. Ye, which are initiated, know what I say; you perhaps understand what is spoken, and perceive what I have obscurely hinted: Let us lift up our souls on high!'

Beside these passages collected out of Chrysostom's Works, published by Fronto Ducæus, there are several others in those Homilies, which Sir Henry Savil set forth in Greek, and others in the Latin editions only. Neither of which I have had opportunity perfectly to examine, and therefore I shall leave them to the more diligent inquiry of the curious reader: only noting, that in the sixth Homily of Repentance[58], he observes

[54] Hom. 14. (B. ibid. p. 141 b. S. ibid. p. 507. 29.) Ἀλλὰ τί; οἱ ὕμνοι οὐκ ἐπουράνιοι; οὐχ ἅπερ ἄνω ᾄδουσιν οἱ θεῖοι χοροὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων, ταῦτα καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ κάτω, σύνῳδα ἐκείνοις, φθεγγόμεθα;

[55] Hom. 17. (B. ibid. p. 166 c. S. ibid. p. 522. 6.) Ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς προσφορᾶς, ἧς ἀναφέρομεν, προφέρομεν καὶ ἁμαρτήματα λέγοντες, Εἴτε ἑκόντες εἴτε ἄκοντες ἡμάρτομεν, συγχώρησον· τουτέστι μεμνήμεθα αὐτῶν πρῶτον, καὶ τότε τὴν συγχώρησιν αἰτοῦμεν.

[56] Ibid. (B. ibid. p. 170 b. S. ibid. p. 524. 13.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ διάκονος [Savil. et Bened. ἱερεὺς] ἐπιφωνεῖ τότε τοὺς ἁγίους καλῶν, καὶ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης μωμοσκοπῶν ἅπαντας, ὥστε μὴ προσελθεῖν τινα ἀπαράσκευον.

[57] Hom. 22. (B. ibid. 207 d. S. ibid. p. 545. 1.) Ἐπαρσίς, φησι, τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἑσπερινή, ἐὰν μετὰ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἀναλάβωμεν. Ἴστε οἱ μεμυημένοι τί λέγω· τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε τὸ λεχθέν, καὶ συνορᾶτε ὅπερ ᾐνιξάμην· Ἐπάρωμεν εἰς ὕψος τὴν διάνοιαν.

[58] De Pœnitent. Hom. 6. t. 7. p. 146. Basil. 1525. (Basil. 1558. t. 5. fol. 866 d.) [Of this Homily the

this difference between David's Psalms and the rest of the Scriptures, 'that the others were read only twice a week in public, but the Psalms were used by all sorts of men, in all places, and upon all occasions. *In ecclesiis pernoctantibus primus et medius, et novissimus est David. When they held their vigils all night in the church, David's Psalms were in the beginning, and middle, and end of all their service.* The same was observed in the morning-prayer; in their funeral-obsequies; by virgins at their needle; by the illiterate and unlearned, who could not read a letter in the book, yet could repeat David's Psalms by heart. David was always in their mouths, not only in the cities and the churches, but in the courts, in the monasteries, in the deserts and the wilderness. He turned earth into heaven, and men into angels, being adapted to all orders, and all capacities, children, young men, virgins, old men, and sinners.' In the beginning of the same Homily[59], he says, 'the book of Genesis was by appointment of the Church read only once a year at a certain season, which was the time of Lent,' as we have heard before in several places of this author, and as we shall see more fully demonstrated from other writers in the next Book.

Among those published in Greek, by Sir H. Savil, the hundred and twenty-third Homily[60] speaks of priests using this form of admonition to all communicants in the time when the holy mysteries were celebrated. '*Ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, Holy things are only for holy men.*' And whoever will bestow the pains to peruse the rest of the Homilies, which are in that edition, may doubtless find many other such fragments of the ancient liturgy, which, as appears from this collection, so much abound in this celebrated writer.

Benedictine Editor, in the *Monitum ad Hom. de Pœnitent.* (t. 2. p. 277.) says, Non Græce reperitur estque supposititia. Ed.]

[59] [Ibid. (a, b.) Moses magnus fuit legislator, facie ad faciem contemplans ipsum vidit Deum . . . Liberque hic maximus est . . . vixque semel eum annis singulis per ecclesias legimus. Ed.]

[60] Hom. 123. juxt. Ed. Savil. (t. 5. p. 809. 29.) *Περιϊὼν πανταχοῦ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ἐκείνης τῆς φρικωδεστάτης ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους καλῶν καὶ ἕλκων πρὸς μετάληψιν τῶν θείων καὶ φρικτῶν μυστηρίων, λέγει, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. . . . Ὑψηλὸς ἑστὼς ὁ ἱερεὺς, μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ, φρικτῇ τῇ βοῇ, καθάπερ τις κήρυξ, τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων εἰς ὕψος, πᾶσι κατάδηλος γεγονὼς, καὶ μέγα ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τῇ φρικτῇ ἡσυχίᾳ ἀνακράζων, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, τοὺς μὲν καλεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἀπείργει.* [The editor terms this Homily (t. 8. p. 750. inter annott.) Apanthisma consarcinatum ex Homm. 20, 15, et 14, in Epistolam ad Hebræos, aliisque locis ethicis Chrysostomi, &c. Ed.]

CHAP. VII.

Of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the liturgy of the ancient Church.

The Lord's Prayer by all the Ancients esteemed a form given by Christ to be used by his disciples.

1. If there were no other argument to prove the lawfulness of set forms of prayer in the judgment of the Ancients, the opinion which they had of the Lord's Prayer, and their practice pursuant to that opinion, would sufficiently do it. And therefore, though several things have been occasionally hinted already about this matter, yet it will not be amiss to give it a distinct handling in this chapter.

And first of all I observe, that the Ancients did not only esteem it as a rule and pattern to conform our prayers to, but looked upon it as a particular form of prayer, which Christ enjoined all his disciples to use in the same words that he delivered it. Tertullian[61] says, 'Our Lord prescribed a new form of prayer for his new disciples of the New Testament: and that though John had taught his disciples a form of prayer, yet all that he did was only as a forerunner of Christ; when Christ was increased, as John had foretold, "He must increase, but I must decrease," then the whole work of the servant passed over to the Lord. And therefore it is not so much as exstant now in what words John taught his disciples to pray, because earthly things were to give way to heavenly.' So again[62], 'The religion of prayer was ordained by Christ himself, and this prayer being animated by his Spirit from the time that it came out of his heavenly mouth, ascends up to heaven with a privilege, commending to the Father what the

[61] De Orat. c. 1. (p. 129 a.)... Dominus noster novis discipulis Novi Testamenti novam orationis formam determinavit.... Docuerat et Ioannes discipulos suos adorare. Sed omnia Ioannis Christo præstruebantur, donec ipso aucto, sicut idem Ioannes prænuntiabat, illum augeri oportere, se vero diminui, totum præministri opus cum ipso Spiritu transiret ad Dominum. Ideo nec exstat in quæ verba docuerit Ioannes adorare, quod terrena cœlestibus cesserint.

[62] Ibid. c. 9. (p. 133 a.) Ab ipso.. ordinata religio orationis, et de Spiritu ipsius jam tunc cum ex ore divino ferretur, animata suo privilegio ascendit in cœlum, commendans Patri, quæ Filius docuit. Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessitatum, seorsum post traditam orandi disciplinam, *Petite*, inquit, *et accipietis;* et sunt quæ petantur pro circumstantia cujusque, præmissa legitima et ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento, accidentium jus est desideriorum, jus est superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones.

Son taught. But because our Lord, who foresaw the necessities of man, after he had given this rule of praying, said also, "Ask and ye shall receive;" and there are many things, which men's particular circumstances oblige every one to ask; therefore we have a right to make additional requests, and build other prayers upon this, always premising this appointed and ordinary prayer, as the foundation.' So that according to Tertullian, it was not only a rule prescribing the method, and matter of prayer, but a form to be used in the words in which Christ delivered it, and to be added to all other prayers as the foundation of a superstructure. After the same manner St. Cyprian[63] says, that 'Christ, among many other wholesome admonitions and divine precepts, by which he provided for the salvation of his people, has given us also a form of prayer, teaching and admonishing us what we are to pray for.' And a little after[64]: 'We are to learn from our Lord's information, what we are to pray for: for, he said, pray thus: Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, &c.'

St. Austin[65] assures us, 'that as the Church always used this prayer, so she used it by the command of Christ: He said, Pray thus: he said to his disciples, Pray thus: he said to his disciples, he said to his Apostles, and to us, who are the lambs, he said, and to the rams of his flock he said, Pray thus.' In another place[66]: 'This prayer is necessary for all, which the Lord gave to the rams of his flock, that is, to his Apostles, that

[63] De Orat. Dom. p. 139. (p. 99.) ...Qui inter cætera salutaria sua monita et præcepta divina, quibus populo suo consuluit ad salutem, etiam orandi ipse formam dedit; ipse quid precaremur, monuit et instruxit.

[64] Ibid. p. 141. (p. 100.) Cognoscamus, docente Domino et quid oremus. *Sic*, inquit, *orate: Pater noster qui es in cœlis, &c.*

[65] Hom. 29. de Verb. Apost. t. 10. p. 150. [al. Serm. 181.] (t. 5. p. 868 d.) Ecclesiæ enim oratio est, vox et de magisterio Domini veniens. Ipse dixit, *Sic orate:* discipulis dixit, *Sic orate.* Discipulis dixit; Apostolis dixit, et nobis, qualescunque agniculi sumus, dixit; arietibus gregis dixit, *Sic orate.*

[66] Ep. 89. [al. 157. c. 1.) ad Hilar. (t. 2. p. 543 b.) Omnibus enim necessaria est oratio dominica, quam etiam ipsis arietibus gregis, id est, Apostolis suis Dominus dedit, ut unusquisque Deo dicat, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.* Cui enim hæc in oratione verba necessaria non fuerint, ipse hic sine peccato vivere pronuntiandus est. Quales si aliquos futuros Dominus prævideret, meliores utique, quam exstiterunt ejus Apostoli, aliam orationem illos doceret, qua non peterent dimitti sibi peccata, quibus in baptismo fuerant omnia jam dimissa.

every one of them should say, Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. For if there is any one to whom these words in the prayer are not necessary, he must be said to be without sin. And if Christ had foreseen, that there would have been any such so much better than his Apostles, he would have taught them another prayer, in which they should not have asked forgiveness of sins for themselves, who had already obtained remission of all in baptism.' Again[67] he says, 'If any one say, that this prayer is not necessary in this life for every saint of God, that knows and does the will of God, except One, the Holy of Holies, he is in a manifest error, and pleases not that God whom he pretends to praise. For this prayer which we use[68] was given as a rule to the Apostles by the heavenly Lawgiver, who said to them, Pray thus. He enjoined the rams of his flock, the leaders of his sheep, the chief members of the great Shepherd, to use it. And they thence learned to say, Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' In his Retractations[69] he confirms all this, calling it 'one of Christ's commands to use this prayer, which the whole Church will continue to use to the end of the world.'

St. Chrysostom in two volumes of his works, the third and fifth[70], repeats this almost twenty times, that the Lord's Prayer was a common form in use among them by the express com-

[67] De Peccat. Merit. l. 3. c. 13. (t. 10. p. 84. a, b.) Quam orationem quisquis cuilibet [etiam] homini sancto, et Dei voluntatem scienti atque facienti, præter unum Sanctum sanctorum, dicit in hac vita necessariam non fuisse, multum errat, nec potest omnino illi ipsi placere quem laudat.

[68] In Ps. 142. p. 675. (t. 4. p. 1592 g.) ... Ipsi didicerunt orare quod oramus, ipsis data est regula postulandi a Jurisperito cœlesti. *Sic orate*, inquit. Et, quum quædam præmisisset, posuit et hoc, ut dicerent arietes nostri, duces ovium, et præcipua membra Pastoris et Congregatoris unius gregis: ipsi didicerunt dicere, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*

[69] L. 1. c. 19. (t. 1. p. 29 f.) Sed in eisdem mandatis est etiam quod jubemur dicere, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, &c.* Quam orationem usque ad finem sæculi tota dicit ecclesia.

[70] [According to the old edition of Fronto Ducæus, Paris, 1609, and that of Commelin, 1617. See before, ch. 6. s. 1. p. 440. n. 2. The third tome of that edition contains the Homilies on the Psalms and on Isaiah, which are found in the fifth and sixth volumes of the Benedictine, or in the first and fifth of the Savilian Edition: while the contents of the fifth tome of Ducæus occur chiefly in the first, second, and third volumes of Montfaucon, or, for the most part, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth of Sir H. Savil. See before, ch. 6. s. 5. p. 456. Ed.]

mand of Christ. And there are many other scattered passages throughout his writings to the same purpose, which, because I have produced them at large in the last chapter, I need not here repeat.

And accordingly it was used by the primitive Church in all her public offices: particularly in the administration of baptism.

2. Evident it is beyond dispute, that the whole primitive Church constantly used it in all her holy offices, out of consciousness and regard to Christ's command. This, as we have heard Tertullian[70] word it, 'was laid, as the foundation of all other prayers.' 'It is the prayer of the Church; the whole Church says, Forgive us our trespasses,' as we have it before[71] in the testimony of St. Austin. And the practice was so universal and well known from the beginning, that Lucian the Heathen is thought to refer to it in one of his Dialogues[72], where he speaks, in the person of a Christian, of the prayer which began *ἀπὸ Πατρὸς, with Our Father.* But we have more certain evidence from the records and offices of the Church. For there was no considerable divine office in the celebration of which this prayer did not always make a solemn part. Particularly in baptism, as soon as the person baptized came up out of the water, he was enjoined to say, Our Father, which art in heaven. 'Immediately after this,' says the author of the Constitutions[73], 'let him stand and pray the prayer which the Lord hath taught us.' And so Chrysostom[74], 'As soon as he rises out of the water, he says those words, Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.'

And in the celebration of the eucharist.

3. In like manner in the celebration of the other sacrament of Christ's body and blood, it was commonly used at the close of the consecration-prayer. So it is expressly more than once noted by St. Austin[75], 'After the sanctification of the sacrifice we say the Lord's Prayer:' and again[76], 'The whole Church

[70] De Orat. c. 9. See before, s. 1. n. 62, preceding.

[71] See n. 65, preceding.

[72] Philopatris. See before, ch. 5. s. 5. p. 381. n. 65.

[73] L. 7. c. 44. [al. 45.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 381.) Μετὰ τοῦτο ἑστὼς προσευχέσθω τὴν εὐχὴν, ἣν ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος.

[74] Hom. 6. in Col. p. 1359. See before, ch. 6. s. 10. p. 476, latter part of n. 47.—Conf. Hom. 62. in Paralyt. t. 5. p. 934. See ibid. s. 5. p. 458. n. 76.

[75] Hom. 83. de Divers. p. 556. [al. Serm. 227.] (t. 5. p. 974 c.) Deinde post sanctificationem sacrificii Dei .... dicimus orationem dominicam.

[76] Ep. 59. [al. 149.] ad Paulin. quæst. 5. (t. 2. p. 509 c.) .... Quam totam petitionem [*precationes* et *orationes*] fere omnis ecclesia dominica oratione concludit.

almost concludes the prayer of benediction and sanctification with the Lord's Prayer.' Upon this account, he tells his hearers[77] 'that all who were communicants heard this prayer said daily at the altar.' And he expressly makes this difference between the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, that men might remember the former by hearing it daily repeated at the altar; but the Creed was not so, for as yet it was never publicly used, but only in the occasional service of baptism; whereas the Lord's Prayer was of constant use by being a daily part of the communion-service. Cyril, in his Mystagogical Catechism to the Illuminated[78], gives the same account of it: 'After the oblation-prayer we say that prayer which our Saviour delivered to his disciples, calling God our Father with a pure conscience, and saying, Our Father, which art in heaven.' And St. Jerom[79], though he do not so precisely note what part of the communion-office it was used in, yet in general, he says, 'Christ taught his Apostles this prayer, that believers might every day in the sacrifice of his body have boldness to say, Our Father, which art in heaven.' And St. Chrysostom[80] in a covert way intimates the same, when he tells his hearers, 'that, if they forgive their enemies, they may come with a pure conscience to the holy and tremendous table, and boldly say the words that are contained in the prayer. The initiated know what I mean.' He means that petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." Which he expresses thus covertly, because of non-communicants, catechumens or infidels, that might be present at a popular discourse in a general assembly. He speaks more plainly in his Sermon upon Eutropius[81], where, pressing the people to forgive the injury which that great statesman had done the Church, he uses this argument to them: 'How otherwise will you take the holy sacrament into your hands, and use the words of that prayer

[77] Hom. 42. inter 50. t. 10. p. 197. [al. Serm. 58. c. 10.] (t. 5. p. 342 f.) In ecclesia enim ad altare Dei quotidie dicitur ista dominica oratio, et audiunt illam fideles.

[78] Catech. [23.] Mystag. 5. n. 8. [al. 11.] p. 298. See before, ch. 5. s. 7. p. 411. n. 65, towards the end.

[79] L. 3. cont. Pelag. c. 5. See ibid. p. 429. n. 45.

[80] Hom. 27. in Gen. p. 358. See before, ch. 6. s. 2. p. 449. n. 36.

[81] Hom. in Eutrop. t. 4. p. 554. See ibid. s. 4. p. 455 n. 65.

wherein we are commanded to say, Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us!'

This plainly shows that the Lord's Prayer was then used as an ordinary and constant part of the communion-service. Only with this difference, that in the Greek Church and the Gallican Church it was said by the priest and all the people together, as Mabillon[82] proves out of Gregory of Tours, and Leontius, in the Life of Johannes Eleemosynarius, bishop of Alexandria, and the Epistles of Gregory the Great[83], who expressly notes the difference between the Greek and Latin Church in this particular: 'Among the Greeks the Lord's Prayer is said by all the people, but with us by the priest alone.' And in this the Gallican Church chose to follow the way of the Greek Church, as we now follow the Gallican Church, and not the Roman. The manner of the Mosarabic Liturgy in Spain is noted also by Mabillon[84] to be different from both these: for there the priest repeated every petition by itself, and the people answered to each petition separately, Amen! But these differences in the manner of using it only serve to confirm the use of it in general, and show us that it was never omitted by any Church in the public service of the altar, at least from the beginning of the fourth century, when Cyril of Jerusalem lived, whose mystical catechisms are a clear evidence for it.

And in the morning and evening prayers.

4. It also made a part in their daily morning and evening prayers distinct from the communion-office. Of which we have instances in the canons of the Councils of Girone[84] and Toledo[85], which shall be recited hereafter, when we come to consider more exactly the several parts of the morning and evening service.

[82] De Liturg. Gallic. l. 1. c. 5. n. 22. ex Greg. Turon. de Mirac. Martini, l. 2. c. 30. (p. 49.) Hanc autem orationem dominicam non solo sacerdote, sed etiam ab adstante populo apud Gallos prolatam fuisse docet Gregorius, &c.

[83] Vid. Greg. M. l. 7. Ep. 64. (CC. t. 5. p. 1348 c.) Sed et dominica oratio apud Græcos ab omni populo dicitur: apud nos vero a solo sacerdote.

[84] [Ubi supr. (p. 50.) Itaque Græcanicum morem, ut in aliis nonnullis, imitabantur Galli. Neque enim quod dominicam orationem cum sacerdote etiam populus decantabat, id fiebat ex imitatione Mozarabum, apud quos populus ad singulas fere dominicæ orationis petitiones respondebat tantum *Amen!* Ed.]

[84] C. 10. (t. 4. p. 1569 b.) Ita nobis placuit, ut omnibus diebus, post matutinas et vespertinas, oratio dominica a sacerdote proferatur.

[85] Tolet. 4. c. 9. See afterwards, s. 6. n. 93, following.

And in their private devotions.

5. They used it also in their private devotions. As is evident from that passage in St. Chrysostom upon the 112th Psalm [86], where he says, 'that Christ, to induce us to unanimity and charity, enjoins us to make common prayer, and obliges the whole Church, as if it were but one person, to say, Our Father: and Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: always using a word of the plural number, and commanding every one, whether he pray alone by himself, or in common with others, still to make prayer for his brethren.' This implies, that in their private devotions, as well as public, they thought themselves obliged by the command of Christ to use the Lord's Prayer. In another place [87] he gives us an instance in the practice of an holy man, who to the form of his private devotions, which he also there recites, always added the Lord's Prayer, or 'the prayer of the faithful,' as he styles it, for a particular reason, of which more by and by; making it both the conclusion and uniting tie of all his other prayers for all men. In compliance with this general practice it is, that the author of the Constitutions [88] orders every one to use the Lord's Prayer three times a day. And this Cotelerius [89] thinks was done in honour of the Holy Trinity, citing Theodoret and Isidore for his opinion. St. Ambrose [90] also, writing instructions to virgins, directs them to sing psalms in bed, and say the Lord's Prayer between every psalm. And the fourth Council of Toledo [91] makes it deprivation for any clergyman to omit using the Lord's Prayer daily, either in his public or pri-

[86] In Ps. 112. p. 369. See before, ch. 6. s. 3. p. 450. n. 41.

[87] Hom. 10. in Col. p. 1385. (t. 11. p. 399 b.) Εἶτα ἐπιθεὶς τὴν εὐχὴν τῶν πιστῶν, ὡς κορωνίδα τινὰ καὶ σύνδεσμον, ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχὴν ποιησάμενος.

[88] L. 7. c. 24. [al. 25.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 370.) Τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτω προσεύχεσθε.

[89] In loc. citat. (ibid.) In honorem Sanctissimæ Trinitatis: ut colligo ex Theodoreto, Ep. 145. et Isidoro, Originum l. 6. c. ult. Euthymium consule ad Psalm. 54, 18. *Dicendum illis,* fidelibus, *ut singulis diebus, qui amplius non potest, saltem duabus vicibus oret, mane scilicet et vespere, dicens symbolum, vel orationem dominicam.*

[90] De Virgin. l. 3. [c. 4. n. 19.] p. 15. (t. 2. p. 179 a.) . . . . . In ipso cubili volo psalmos cum oratione dominica frequenti contexas vice.

[91] C. 9. [al. 10.] (t. 5. p. 1708 e.) Quisquis ergo sacerdotum vel subjacentium clericorum hanc orationem dominicam quotidie aut in publico aut in privato officio præterierit, propter superbiam judicatus, ordinis sui honore privetur [al. mulctetur].

vate offices of devotion, censuring him as a proud contemner of the Lord's injunction.

Whence it had the name of *oratio quotidiana*, the Christian's *daily prayer*.

6. Now this being the constant use, that was daily made of the Lord's Prayer, it hence took the name of *oratio quotidiana, the daily prayer*, as is observed in the foresaid canon of that Council. And so we find it styled in Cyprian [92], who thought that petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," might be taken in a spiritual, as well as a literal sense, and refer to the eucharist, or the body and blood of Christ, the celestial bread, which they then desired to receive every day. And the Council of Toledo [93] cites St. Hilary to the same purpose: '*Give us this day our daily bread!* for God desires nothing so much as that Christ may dwell in us daily, who is the bread of life, and the bread that comes from heaven. And because this is our daily prayer, we therefore pray daily that this bread may be given us.' St. Austin [94] also means the Lord's Prayer, when he says, 'that the Christians' daily prayer makes satisfaction for those lesser and daily failings, without which no man lives.' Upon which account he says in another place [95], 'that this daily prayer is a sort of daily baptism, because in the pious use of it men obtain daily remission of sins, as they did at first in baptism.' Possidius [96] also makes this remark in his Life, upon his practice and that of St. Ambrose, 'that they both trusted more in God's mercy than their own merits, being used to pray in the words of our Lord's daily Prayer, Forgive us our trespasses,

[92] De Orat. Dom. p. 147. (p. 104.) Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus...a Christi corpore separemur.

[93] Ibid. ut supr. n. 91. (p. ead. d.) Sanctus Hilarius dicit, *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.* Quid enim tam vult Deus quam ut quotidie Christus habitet in nobis, qui est panis vitæ et panis e cœlo? Et quia quotidiana oratio est, quotidie quoque ut detur, oratur.

[94] Enchirid. c. 71. (t. 6. p. 223 b.) De quotidianis autem brevibus levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana oratio fidelium satisfacit. Eorum enim est dicere, *Pater noster qui es in cœlis, &c.*

[95] Hom. 119. De Temp. p. 306. [al. Serm. 213.] (t. 5. p. 942 e.) Ideo remissio peccatorum non est in sola ablutione sacri baptismatis, sed etiam in oratione dominica et quotidiana. In illa invenietis quasi quotidianum baptismum vestrum, &c.

[96] Vit. August. c. 27. (t. 10. append. p. 276 d.) ..... De bono se dixit Domino magis quam de meritis suis confidere. Cui etiam in oratione quotidiana dominica dicebat, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, &c.*

as we forgive them that trespass against us!' From all which, and much more that might be alleged upon this head, it appears, that this prayer, in the very words which Christ delivered it in, was not only an allowed form, but a prayer of daily use both in their public and private devotions.

And was used by all heretics and schismatics as well as Catholics.

7. Neither were there any sects or heresies, that pretended in those times to object the least thing against the use of it. The Donatists broke off from the Church, and set up conventicles of their own, but they did not alter the way of worship: they still thought themselves obliged, as Optatus[97] says, to use the Lord's Prayer at the altar. The Pelagians could not relish well one petition in it, Forgive us our trespasses: for they proudly thought the saints were without sin, and had nothing to ask forgiveness of: yet they also continued to use it, and accounted for their practice by putting this false gloss upon it, that they then prayed not for their own sins but the sins of others. We find this often objected to them in the African Councils[98], but never any charge brought against them, as if they omitted the Lord's Prayer in whole, or even this single petition in it. St. Austin indeed often[99] says, 'that

[97] L. 2. p. 57. (p. 79.) Ad altare conversi dominicam orationem prætermittere non potestis.—It. l. 3. p. 72. (p. 78.) Oratio dominica apud nos et apud vos una est.

[98] C. Milev. c. 8. [al. 7.] (t. 2. p. 1539 d.) Quicunque dixerit, in oratione dominica ideo dicere sanctos, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ut non pro seipsis hoc dicant, quia non est eis jam necessaria ista petitio, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in suo populo peccatores: et ideo non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, *Dimitte mihi debita mea*, sed, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ut hoc pro aliis potuis, quam pro se justus petere intelligatur, anathema sit.—C. 9. [al. 8.] (ibid. p. 1540 b.) Placuit, ut quicunque verba ipsa dominicæ orationis, ubi dicimus, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, ita volunt a sanctis dici, ut humiliter, non veraciter, hoc dicatur, anathema sit.—Cod. Afric. c. 116. [al. 115.] (ibid. 1123 e.) *Ἤρεσεν, ἵνα ὅστις δήποτε εἴποι, ἐν τῇ δεσποτικῇ εὐχῇ διὰ τοῦτο λέγειν τοὺς ἁγίους, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν· οὐχ ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν τοῦτο λέγουσι, ἐπειδὴ αὐτοῖς λοιπὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναγκαία αὕτη ἡ αἴτησις, ἀλλ' ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἄλλων τῶν ὄντων ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν· καὶ μὴ λέγειν ἕνα ἕκαστον τῶν ἁγίων, Ἄφες μοι τὰ ὀφειλήματά μου, ἀλλ' Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν· ὡς ὑπὲρ ἄλλων τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν δίκαιον αἰτοῦντα νοεῖσθαι, ἀνάθεμα εἴη.*—C. 117. [al. 116.] (ibid. 1126 c.) *Ὁμοίως ἤρεσεν, ἵνα οἵτινες δήποτε αὐτὰ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς δεσποτικῆς εὐχῆς, ὅπου λέγομεν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, οὕτως βούλονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων λέγεσθαι, ὡς ταπεινοφρόνως καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα λεχθῆναι, ἀνάθεμα εἴη.*

[99] Ep. 92. [al. 176.] ad Innocent. (t. 2. p. 621 a.) . . Nobis etiam dominicam orationem impiis disputationibus conantur auferre. . . . Isti dicunt posse hominem in hac vita, præceptis Dei cognitis, ad tantam perfectionem justitiæ sine adjutorio gratiæ Salvatoris, per solum liberum

their impious tenets and disputations tended to take away the use of the Lord's Prayer.' But then he explains himself to mean, not that they laid aside the use of it, but that they taught 'that a man might come to such perfection in righteousness in this life. by observing all the commands, and that by his own free-will, without the help of the grace of Christ, that he needed not to say, Forgive us our trespasses, for himself, but only for others.' They owned, that the Apostles used the Lord's Prayer; but then they said, 'they were so holy and perfect without all manner of sin, that they did not say for themselves, Forgive us our trespasses, but only for other sinners that were yet imperfect.' St. Chrysostom mentions another sort of men, who were also offended at this petition because of the condition that was in it, Forgive us, as we forgive others; and therefore they curtailed the prayer by dropping this petition, when they said it: but he rebukes them [1] for this, and bids them 'not be so vainly cautious, as to think they were excused by curtailing the prayer, but advises them to use the whole prayer, as Christ appointed it to be used, that the necessity of this petition might daily terrify them from revenge, and compel them to grant pardon to their neighbours.' So that though there were some heretics and other ill men, who did not like this one petition for different reasons, yet they all continued to use the prayer either in whole or in part, and there is no instance of any that totally rejected it.

That it was esteemed a divine and spiritual form of prayer.

8. There was no objection against it in those days, that it was a form, or that it was not a spiritual prayer, because it was used in the very words in which Christ had delivered it;

voluntatis arbitrium pervenire, ut ei non sit jam necessarium dicere, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra.*—Conf. de Peccat. Merit. l. 2. c. 10. (t. 10. p. 47 b.) .... Quidam contra orationem dominicam argumentantur; quia etsi orabant eam, inquiunt, sancti et perfecti jam Apostoli, nultum omnino habentes peccatum, non tamen pro seipsis, sed pro imperfectis et adhuc peccatoribus dicebant, *Dimitte nobis, &c.*—It. Ep. 94. [al. 178.] ad Hilar. (t. 2. p. 629 f.) Omnes, enim, qui spem habemus in Christo, huic pestiferæ impietati resistere, eamque concorditer damnare et anathematizare debemus, quæ contradicit etiam orationibus nostris, concedens quidem, ut dicamus, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris:* et hoc ita concedens, ut asserat hominem in hoc corruptibili corpore, quod aggravat animam, posse suis viribus ad tantam justitiam pervenire, ut neque hoc illi sit dicere necessarium, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra.*

[1] Hom. 22. t. 1. p. 288. See before, ch. 6. s. 1. p. 443. nn. 14, 15, 16.

but on the contrary, it was recommended as the most spiritual and prevalent prayer that could be used, because of the dignity of its author. St. Cyprian thus argues for the use of it: 'Christ,' says he[2], 'had foretold that the hour was coming when the true worshippers should worship the Father in spirit and in truth: and he fulfilled what he had promised before, that we, who had received the Spirit and truth by his sanctification, might worship in spirit and truth by his tradition, or the prayer which he delivered to us. For what prayer can be more spiritual than that which is given us by Christ, by whom the Holy Spirit is sent to us? What can be esteemed a truer prayer with the Father than that which came out of the mouth of his Son, who is truth itself? So that to pray otherwise than he has taught us, is not only ignorance, but a crime, since he has laid it down, and said, Ye reject the commandment of God, to establish your own tradition. Let us therefore, my dearly beloved brethren, pray as our God and Master taught us. It is a friendly and familiar way of praying, to beseech God in his own words to let the prayer of his Son come up to his ears. Let the Father hear and acknowledge the words of his Son: when we make our prayers, let him that dwells in our heart be also in our voice. And forasmuch as we have him our Advocate with the Father for our sins, when we sinners pray for the pardon of our sins, let us bring forth the words of our Advocate. For since he has said, that whatever we ask the Father in his name, he will give it us, how much more

[2] De Orat. Dom. p. 139. (p. 99.) Jam [Christus] prædixerat, horam venire, quando veri adoratores adorarent Patrem in Spiritu et veritate, et implevit quod ante promisit; ut, qui Spiritum et veritatem de ejus satisfactione percepimus, de traditione quoque ejus vere et spiritaliter adoremus. Quæ enim potest esse magis spiritalis oratio, quam quæ a Christo nobis data est, a quo nobis et Spiritus Sanctus missus est? Quæ vera magis apud Patrem precatio, quam quæ a Filio, qui est veritas, de ejus ore prolata est? Ut aliter orare quam docuit, non ignorantia sola sit, sed et culpa; quando ipse posuerit et dixerit, *Rejicitis mandatum Dei, ut traditionem vestram statuatis.* Oremus itaque, fratres dilectissimi, sicut magister Deus docuit. Amica et familiaris oratio est Deum de suo rogare, ad aures ejus adscendere Christi oratione. Agnoscat Pater Filii sui verba. Cum precem facimus, qui habitat intus in pectore, ipse sit et in voce. Et cum ipsum habeamus apud Patrem advocatum pro peccatis nostris; quando peccatores pro delictis nostris petimus, advocati nostri verba promamus. Nam cum dicat, quia *quodcunque petierimus a Patre in nomine ejus, dabit nobis,* quanto efficacius impetramus, quod petimus in Christi nomine, si petamus ipsius oratione?

efficaciously shall we obtain what we ask in the name of Christ, if we ask it in his prayer?' He introduces all this discourse with these words[2]: 'He that made us live taught us to pray, by the same kindness that he confers all other things upon us; that whilst we speak to the Father in the prayer and orison which the Son taught us, we should more easily be heard.' So far was this holy man from thinking the Lord's Prayer a dead form, that could not be offered with the true spirit of prayer, that on the contrary he labours with all his might to convince men, that no prayer could be more justly styled worshipping God in spirit and in truth, or with greater efficacy and advantages be presented to the Father.

St. Chrysostom was of the same mind, that praying by the Lord's Prayer might justly be termed praying by the Spirit: for he uses this as an argument for the Holy Spirit's operation upon us. 'If there were no Holy Ghost,' says he[3], 'we that are believers could not pray to God: for we say, Our Father which art in heaven. As therefore we could not say that Jesus was the Lord, so neither could we call God our Father without the Holy Ghost. How does that appear? From the same Apostle, who says, [Gal. 4, 6.] Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.*' And St. Austin[4], expounding those words of the Apostle, (Rom. 8, 26.) "We know not what to pray for as we ought; but the Spirit helpeth our infirmities;" concludes, 'that the Spirit's helping and teaching them to pray as they ought, could not mean his helping them to new words and expressions; for both the Apostle, and they to whom he wrote, were well acquainted already with the Lord's Prayer; so that there could be no want of the Spirit's assistance in that respect; but the want was this; men are commonly ignorant of the real benefit of temporal tribulation and affliction, which tends either to cure the tumour of pride, or exercise and try men's patience, and crown it with a greater reward, or else to

[2] Ibid. (p. 99.) Qui fecit vivere, docuit et orare; benignitate ea, scilicet, qua et cætera dare et conferre dignatus est: ut dum prece et oratione, quam Filius docuit, apud Patrem loquimur, facilius audiamur.

[3] Hom. 36. de S. Pentecost. t. 5. p. 552. See before, ch. 6. s. 5. p. 457. n. 73.

[4] Ep. 121. [al. 130.] ad Probam, c. 14. (t. 2. p. 391 f.) Neque enim ullo modo credendum est, vel ipsum, vel quibus ista dicebat, dominicam nescisse orationem.

chastise and abolish such other sins as they are subject to. Men being ignorant of these advantages, are usually most inclined to ask a perfect freedom and immunity from temporal affliction; but the Spirit corrects this ignorance, and helps this infirmity, and teaches men rather to ask patience of God, and submission to his will, that they may not think themselves neglected of God, though he do not remove such afflictions, but with a devout and pious patience hope for greater good arising from them.' This is St. Austin's exposition of that famous passage of the Apostle, concerning the assistance of the Spirit in prayer; by which he is so far from derogating from the Lord's Prayer, as void of the Spirit, that he supposes the very knowledge of it to be antecedently a work of the Spirit: and he says further [5], 'that when men believe, and hope, and desire, and consider the things they ask of God in the Lord's Prayer, they are then qualified with those graces of the Spirit, faith, hope, and charity, which are necessary to bring a pious votary unto God.' Men that say such things as these of the Lord's Prayer, could not conceive any mean thing about it, derogatory to the spirit of prayer; but must be presumed to entertain the most high and venerable notions of it, of any that can possibly be imagined.

And the use of it a peculiar privilege, allowed only to communicants and perfect Christians.

9. And that they did so, is evident from one thing further, very observable in the ancient discipline and practice: that is, that then the use of the Lord's Prayer was not a mark of infamy or reproach, but an honorary privilege, allowed to none but communicants, or complete and perfect Christians. For, as I have had occasion to remark once or twice [6] in former parts of this work, all catechumens or persons unbaptized were absolutely debarred from the use of this prayer; they were not allowed to call God *Our Father*, till they were regenerated and made sons by the waters of baptism. I have noted several passages out of St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret to this purpose, which need not here be repeated. To these I shall only add one passage out of Chrysostom [7], in his Homily

[5] Ep. 121. [al. 130.] ad Probam, c. 13. (t. 2. p. 391 e.) Fides ergo et spes et caritas ad Deum perducunt orantem, hoc est, credentem, sperantem, desiderantem, et quæ petat a Domino in dominica oratione considerantem.

[6] B. 1. ch. 4. s. 7. v. 1. p. 94, and b. 10. ch. 5. s. 9. v. 3. p. 562.

[7] Hom. 62. See before, ch. 6. s. 5. p. 458. n. 76.

upon the Paralytic, where speaking of baptism, he says, 'Before we have washed away our sins in the font of the holy waters, we cannot call God *Our Father:* but when we return from thence, having put off the load of our sins, then we say, *Our Father which art in heaven!*' And upon this account, as has been also noted before [8], this prayer was peculiarly called εὐχὴ πιστῶν, *the prayer of communicants*, or *believers*, because none had a right to use this prayer, but only such as had a right to communicate at the altar, and there hear it daily repeated.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the use of habits, and gestures, and other rites and ceremonies in the service of the ancient Church.

No certain evidence for the use of distinct habits in the apostolical age, or the two following ages.

1. The next things to be spoken of are the circumstances and ceremonies of habits, gestures, and times appropriated to divine service. Of all these it may be said in general, that as they are matters of indifferent usage in their own nature, so the Church used her liberty in the appointment and observation of them. The writers of the Romish Church, Baronius [1], Du Saussay [2], and Bona [3], who will have every ceremony to be apostolical, pretend that the Apostles themselves wore a distinct habit in all their sacred ministrations. Bona [4] is very confident that St. Paul's cloak [5] which he left at Troas was a

[8] See b. 1. ch. 4. s. 7. v. 1. p. 34, and afterwards, ch. 7. s. 9. of this Book.

[1] [Conf. ad an. 18. c. 1. (Antwerp. 1612. t. 1. p. 82 d, e.) ubi *de Stola Pontificia.*—Item ad an. 58. c. 69. (ibid. p. 543 2.) ubi *de Penula Veste Sacerdotali.*—Baronius thinks St. Paul's φαιλόνη or *penula* was the sacerdotal vest, which the Apostle could, he says, easily have obtained at Rome; and thus he seems to differ from Bona. See as above, ad an. 58. cc. 68, 69. Consult also ad an. 261. cc. 40–44, where Baronius speaks of the *birrus* and *dalmatica* of Cyprian. Ed.]

[2] [Carolus de la Saussaye, doctor Sorbonicus, anno 1600. Decanus erat Ecclesiæ Aurelianensis, cum Annales Aurelianensis Ecclesiæ stylo Latino terso et nitido diligenter descripsit, &c. Vid. Continuat. c. 120. ad calc. Bellarmin. de Scriptor. Eccles. (Colon. 1684. p. 71.)—I do not readily discover the precise passage referred to, where Du Saussay makes the statement in the text. Ed.]

[3] See nn. 4 and 7, following.

[4] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 24. n. 1. (p. 248.) Huc autem pertinet penula a Paulo Troade relicta, quam fuisse vestem sacerdotalem suo loco indicabo.

[5] [2 Tim. 4, 13. Τὸν φαιλόνην, ὃν ἀπέλιπον κ. τ. λ. Baskerville, Oxon. 1763.—Φελόνης and φαιλόνης are supposed to be dubious, but φαινόλης, according to the Lexicons, is more correct. See also Leigh's Critica Sacra, (Lond. 1650. p. 275.)

sacerdotal vestment. And others speak of St. Peter's *planeta*[6], which is said to be sent from Antioch to Paris, and kept there as a sacred relic in the temple of St. Genouesa, [or Genovefa.] And others mention St. John's, which is said to be sent to Gregory the Great. But Bona himself[7] will not undertake to vouch for these, because of the silence of all ancient writers about them. Yet he is very angry with Nicholas Alemannius[8], [or Alemannus,] for saying that neither the Apostles nor apostolical men used any sacred vestments, and that the opinion which maintains it is to be exploded as ridiculous, and as what is rejected by learned men. Vicecomes[9] was a diligent inquirer

Φελόνη, penula, (2 Tim. 4, 13.) where after noticing the other terms, as above, and the disputes of interpreters whether the word be Greek or Latin, as well as its meaning as used by St. Paul, he adds, Beza et alii putant fuisse vestem viatoriam, frigoribus ac pluviis arcendis adhibitam, quo sensu eam *vestimentum quoddam* vocat Œcumenius. . . . . Probabile est *φελόνη* corruptum esse ex *φενόλη*, et hoc formatum a *penula*. . . . . Estius ad loc. existimat *φελόνην*, sive *φαιλόνην* potius significare arculam libris chartisque refertam, quam penulam, ac notat *φέλλος* significare *librum*, id est, *arboris corticem*, ex quo volumina olim fiebant. Quidam *volumen Legis*, alii *vestem consularem*. Syrus, *domum scriptorum*, id est *scrinium* aut *scriniolum*, in quo scripta reponuntur, &c. Drusius, Præterit. l. 8., *Pallii genus*, non consularis, ut quidam putant, sed quo tegimur ab imbribus: *pelliceus*, ut putat Hesychius, quanquam idem addubitat num sit *scriniolum*. Alii putant esse *thecam librorum*. Hieronymus vertit *lacernam*, sive *penulam*.—Conf. Lexic. Vocum Peregrin. in Scriptt. Gr. Obviarum, ap. Stephan. Thesaur. Lond. 1816–18. v. 1. p. 462. Ed.]

[6] [Ap. Du Fresne, Glossar. Latinit. in voc. (Paris. 1734. t. 5. col. 540.) Planetam B. Petri Antiochia delatam, in ecclesia S. Genovefæ Parisiensis olim asservatam, scribunt Hildebertus Cenomanensis et Hugo Monachus Cluniacensis in Vita S. Hugonis, Abbat. Cluniac. pp. 425, 442. Ed.]

[7] L. 1. c. 5. n. 2. (p. 183.) Planetæ S. Petri, ab Antiochia Parisios delatæ et in templo S. Genouesæ collocatæ, meminit in Vita S. Hugonis Cluniacensis alter Hugo, ejusdem monasterii monachus, apud Surium, die 29 Aprilis. Sacram item vestem Sancti Ioannis Evangelistæ Gregorio Magno transmissam refert Ioannes diaconus in ejus Vita, lib. 3, c. 59. . . . Sunt et aliæ quædam historiæ de vestibus Apostolorum, quibus in oblatione divini sacrificii usi fuisse dicuntur, quarum dubia est fides, tum propter antiquitatem, tum propter veterum de illis silentium.

[8] Ibid. . . . . Audacius igitur quam par esset, Nicolaus Alemannius in *Dissertatione de Parietinis Lateranensibus, c. 9*, sacrarum vestium usum non solum Apostolis, sed etiam apostolicis viris abnegat: idque ait explodendum esse tanquam ridiculum, et ab omnibus viris doctis improbari. Nimia prorsus audacia. Nemo enim negabit viros doctos fuisse Valdensem, Democharem, Baronium, Stapletonium, Saussayum, et alios contrariæ sententiæ assertores, &c. [Nicholas Alemanni, an antiquary of great learning; born 1583, of Greek parents; died 1626. Watt thus mentions the work to which Bona refers: De Lateranensibus Parietinis a Card. Baberino restitutis. Romæ, 1629. It. ap. Grævii Thesaur. Antiquit. t. 8. Ed.]

[9] [In the fourth volume of his *Observationes Ecclesiasticæ, &c.* (Me-

into antiquity, and yet he could find no ground for this assertion, but has some arguments against it, which Bona is put to answer. And till some better arguments can be produced to support it, I think it most prudent to leave uncertain tradition to shift for itself, and proceed to an age wherein we have more light and certainty in the matter.

What evidence there is for them in the fourth century.

2. In the beginning then of the fourth age, when the Church was quietly composed by Constantine, and settled in peace, we are sure a distinction was made in the habits and vestments of divine service. For Constantine himself is said[9] to have given a rich vestment embroidered with gold to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, to be worn by him when he celebrated the service of baptism; and it was one of the accusations that the Arians afterward brought against Cyril, that he had sold it. Valesius[10] thinks that it was not intended for an ordinary habit, whenever the bishop celebrated the office of baptism, but only when he performed the service of the great day of our Lord's baptism, which was the festival of Epiphany, held in great veneration at Jerusalem. This is not so likely in my opinion, but, be it as it will, it makes no alteration in the case: for still it was a sacred vestment to be used in the celebration of the liturgy or divine service, which is enough to the present purpose. Not long after we find Athanasius accused by his enemies for laying a tax upon the Egyptians, to raise a fund for the linen vest-

diolan. 1615–26. 4 tom. 4to.) He there treats largely *de Missæ Apparatu*, and enters fully into the subject of *vestments*. *Explicantur singulæ vestes et vasa, quibus prisci sacerdotes Christiani in sacris utebantur, et quicquid aliud ad Missæ supellectilem in religionis nostræ incunabulis pertinuit.* Vicecomes seems to argue expressly in behalf of the apostolical use of sacerdotal dresses. See, e. g., the 16th chapter of the 3rd book of that 4th volume (p. 142.) whereof the title is as follows: *De veteri succinctorii usu, quem ab apostolicis ductum temporibus in hanc usque ætatem transmissum esse Patrum auctoritatibus ostenditur.* Ed.]

[9] Theodoret. l. 2. c. 27. (v. 3. p. 110. 21.) Τὴν γὰρ ἱερὰν στολὴν, ἣν ὁ πανεύφημος Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς, τὴν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίαν γεραίρων, δεδώκει τῷ Μακαρίῳ τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἀρχιερεῖ, ἵνα, ταύτην περιβαλλόμενος, τὴν τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος ἐπιτελῇ λειτουργίαν· ἐκ χρυσῶν δὲ αὕτη κατεσκεύαστο νημάτων.

[10] [In loc. (ibid. n. 2.) Hunc locum de baptismi sacramento intellexerunt interpretes. Ego vero de festo Epiphaniorum die malim intelligere, quo Christus in Jordane est baptizatus. Hunc enim diem præcipuo honore colebant Hierosolymitani, eo quod apud ipsos Christus tinctus fuisset. Eoque die infantes baptizari apud illos solebant, ut legere memini in Typico monasterii Sancti Sabæ, ubi etiam officium illius diei refertur. *Grischov.*]

ments of the church. The thing is mentioned both by Athanasius himself[11] and Sozomen[12], the one calling them linen *sticharia*, and the other linen *tunicles*, which are the same thing. Where we are to observe, that the accusation was not that he used such vestments in the church, but only that he laid a tax upon the people to provide them; which supposes them to be in use, else there had been no colour or foundation for such a charge against him.

St. Jerom often mentions this distinction of habits as generally observed in his time. I urge not those words which he has in his Commentary upon Ezekiel[13], 'the religion of God has one habit in its ministry, and another for the common uses of life;' because I think he is there speaking of the Jewish priests, in opposition to the idol-priests of Isis and Serapis. But what he says in his Book against Pelagius[14] plainly relates to the Christians: 'What harm or enmity, I pray, is it against God, if I use a more cleanly garment? if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the ecclesiastical order, come forth in a white vestment when they administer the sacraments?' He says also in his Epitaph upon Nepotian[15], that Nepotian for his ordinary wearing used the *pallium*, the cloak that was in common use among Christian philosophers: but in his ministrations he used a tunicle, which he ordered his uncle Heliodore to send as his legacy to St. Jerom.

St. Chrysostom also intimates that the deacons wore a peculiar habit in their ministrations, when[16] he says, 'their honour, crown and glory did not consist so much in their walking about the church in a white and shining garment, as in their

[11] Apol. 2. p. 778. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 141 b.) Πλάττονται πρώτην κατηγορίαν περὶ στιχαρίων λινῶν, ὡς ἐμοῦ κανόνα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιβάλλοντος.

[12] L. 2. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 73. 33.)... Πρώτην ἀπομένει γραφὴν, ὡς χιτωνίων λινῶν φόρον ἐπιτιθεὶς Αἰγυπτίοις.

[13] In Ezek. c. 44. [vv. 17, seqq.] p. 668. (t. 5. p. 548 a.) Porro religio divina alterum habitum habet in ministerio, alterum in usu vitaque communi.

[14] L. 1. cont. Pelag. (t. 2. p. 713 d.) Quæ sunt, rogo, inimicitiæ contra Deum, si tunicam habuero mundiorem? Si episcopus, presbyter, diaconus, et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus in administratione sacramentorum candida veste processerint?

[15] Ep. 3. [al. 60.] ad Heliodor. See before, ch. 5. s. 7. p. 428. n. 41. Ep. ad Præsid. Diacon. (t. 11. p. 156 b.) Sed considera, obsecro, satis esse difficile locum Stephani implere, et populos subjacentes candenti desuper vesti despicere.

[16] Hom. 82. al. 83. in Matth. p. 705. (t. 7. p. 789 d.).... Τοῦτο ὑμῶν ἡ ἀξία, τοῦτο ἡ ἀσφάλεια, τοῦτο ὁ στέφανος, οὐχ ἵνα λευκὸν χιτωνίσκον καὶ ἀποστίλβοντα περιβαλλόμενοι περιΐητε.

power to repel unworthy communicants from the Lord's table.' This implies that they had a distinct habit when they ministered in divine service. And so it is remarked by Sozomen[17], when speaking of the assault that was made upon the Church by the enemies of Chrysostom, he says, 'the priests and deacons were beaten and driven out of the church, as they were in the vestments of their ministration.' And there is among St. Chrysostom's works an Homily upon the Prodigal Son, written by Severianus, bishop of Gabala, contemporary with St. Chrysostom, who, speaking of the deacons ministering in the sacred mysteries, says[18], 'they resembled the wings of angels with their veils or tippets on their left shoulders, running about the church, and crying out, Let none of the catechumens be present at the celebration of the mysteries! &c.' In like manner Nazianzen, in his Vision of the Church of Anastasia[19], represents the deacons standing *ἐν εἵμασι παμφανόωσιν, in their bright and shining garments.* And in his Will[20] he leaves to his deacon Evagrius, a *κάμοσον*, and a *στιχάριον*, which were then the common names for these surplices or white garments used in divine service.

The Council of Laodicea has two canons[21] concerning the little habit called the *orarium*, which was *a scarf* or *tippet* to be worn upon the shoulders, and might be used by bishops, presbyters and deacons, but not by subdeacons, singers or readers, who are expressly debarred the use of it in that Council. The fourth Council of Carthage[22] speaks of the *alba* or *surplice*, which the deacon is ordered to wear when the oblation is made, or the lessons are read. The Council of

[17] L. 8. c. 21. (v. 2. p. 352. 29.) Ἱερέων δὲ καὶ διακόνων τυπτομένων, καὶ πρὸς βίαν, ὡς εἶχον σχήματος, ἐλαυνομένων.

[18] Hom. 37. de Fil. Prod. t. 6. p. 375. (t. 8. int. Spuria, p. 37 a.) ... Μεμνημένοι ... τῶν λειτουργῶν τῆς θείας ἱερουργίας, τῶν μιμουμένων τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων πτέρυγας ταῖς λεπταῖς ὀθόναις, ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ὤμων κειμέναις, κ. τ. λ. See before, ch. 6. s. 6. p. 461. n. 88.

[19] Somn. &c. (t. 2. p. 78 b.)

Οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑποδρηστῆρες ἐν εἵμασι παμφανόωσιν

Ἕστασαν, ἀγγελικῆς εἰκόνες ἀγλαΐης.

[20] Ap. Brisson. de Formul. l. 7. (p. 671. sive p. 671. sub med.) .... Βούλομαι αὐτῷ δοθῆναι κάμασον ἕνα, καὶ στιχάριον ἓν, πάλλια β', κ. τ. λ.

[21] C. 22. (t. 1. p. 1500 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην ὠράριον φορεῖν, οὐδὲ τὰς θύρας ἐγκαταλιμπάνειν.—C. 23. (e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἀναγνώστας ἢ ψάλτας ὠράριον φορεῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν καὶ ψάλλειν.

[22] C. 41. (t. 2. p. 1203 d.) Ut diaconus in tempore oblationis tantum vel lectionis alba induatur [al. utatur].

Narbo[23] mentions the same. The first Council of Braga[24] speaks of the *tunica* and the *orarium*, as both belonging to deacons. And the third Council of Braga[25] orders priests to wear the *orarium* on both shoulders when they ministered at the altar. By which we learn, that the *tunica* or *surplice* was common to all the clergy, the *orarium* on the left shoulder proper to deacons, and on both shoulders the distinguishing badge of priests.

The fourth Council of Toledo is most particular in these distinctions. For in one canon[26] it says, 'that if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon be unjustly degraded, and be found innocent by a synod, yet they shall not be what they were before, unless they receive the degrees they had lost from the hands of the bishops before the altar. If he be a bishop, he must receive his *orarium*, his ring, and his staff: if a presbyter, his *orarium* and *planeta:* if a deacon, his *orarium* and *alba*.' And in another canon[27], 'that the deacon shall wear but one *orarium*, and that upon his left shoulder, wherewith he is to give the signal of prayers to the people.' Where we may observe also the reason of the name *orarium* in the ecclesiastical sense, *ab orando, from praying;* though in common acceptation it signifies no more than an handkerchief to wipe the face, and so comes from *ore;* in which signification it is sometimes used by St. Ambrose[28], and St. Austin[29], as well as

[23] Anno 589, c. 12. (t. 5. p. 1020. [corrige, 1030] d.).... Nec diaconus, aut subdiaconus certe, vel lector, antequam missa consummetur, alba se præsumat exuere.

[24] C. 27. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 9.] (ibid. 841 a.) Placuit ut, quia in aliquantis hujus provinciæ ecclesiis diacones absconsis infra tunicam utuntur orariis, ita ut nihil differre a subdiacono videantur, de cætero superposito scapulæ, sicut, decet utantur orario.

[25] C. 3. (al. Bracar. 4. c. 4.] (t. 6. p. 564 f.) Cum sacerdos ad solennia missarum accedit, aut pro se Deo sacrificium oblaturus, aut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi sumpturus, non aliter accedat quam orario utroque humero circumseptus.

[26] C. 27. [al. 28.] (t. 5. p. 1714 b.) Episcopus, presbyter, aut diaconus, si a gradu suo injuste dejectus, in sancta [al. secunda] synodo innocens reperiatur, non potest esse quod fuerat, nisi gradus amissos recipiat coram altario de manu episcoporum. Si episcopus est, orarium, annulum, et baculum. Si presbyter, orarium et planetam. Si diaconus, orarium et albam.

[27] C. 39. [al. 40.] (ibid. p. 1716 c.).... Unum igitur orarium oportet Levitam gestare in sinistro humero, propter quod orat, id est, prædicat.

[28] De Obit. S. Satyr. Fratr. [al. l. 2. de S. Satyr. n. 78.] (t. 2. p. 1155 b.) Audivit ergo defunctus [Lazarus] et exivit foras de monumento, ligatus pedes et manus institis, et facies ejus orario colligata erat.—Conf. Ep. 54. [al. 22.] ad

by the old Roman authors[30]. But here we take it in the ecclesiastical sense, for a sacred habit appropriated to bishops, priests, and deacons in the solemnities of divine service, in which sense it appears to have been an habit distinct from that of civil and common use by all the authorities that have been mentioned.

The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin[31], speaks also of the *dalmatica*, as worn both by bishops and deacons: but whether it was then a garment of sacred use, is not said by him or any other ancient writer that I know of; and therefore I content myself with the proofs already alleged, as sufficient to show that in the fourth age a plain distinction of habits was made in the sacred service of the Church.

Four postures of devotion allowed by the Ancients.

3. The next considerable circumstance in their worship was the posture observed in their addresses and adorations of God: and of this we find four kinds generally practised and allowed, viz. standing, kneeling, bowing, and prostration. For *sitting*, which some add as a fifth sort, was never allowed by the Ancients as an ordinary posture of devotion.

First, Standing, which was particularly enjoined on the Lord's-day, and all the time between Easter and Pentecost.

Standing was the general observation of the whole Church on the Lord's-day, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. This custom may be traced as high as Irenæus, who derives it from apostolical authority. For the author, under the name of Justin Martyr[32], gives this account

Marcellin. (ibid. p. 876 e. n. 9.) Quanta oraria jactitantur? Quanta indumenta super reliquias sacratissimas et tactu ipso medicabilia reposcuntur?

[29] De Civitat. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. (t. 7. p. 667 f.) Tunc, sicut potuit, oculum lapsum atque pendentem loco suo revocatum ligavit orario, &c. [Conf. Pontii. Act. Pass. Cypr. juxt. Ed. Rigaltii, Paris. 1666. ex Act. Pass. secundum Editiones Manutii et Morellii. (p. 15.) Fratres vero flentes linteamina et *oraria* ante eum ponebant, ne sanctus cruor defluens absorberetur a terra.—According to the reading in Fell's Edition, Oxon. 1682, (p. 13.) Linteamina vero et *manualia* a fratribus ante eum mittebantur. Ed.]

[30] [Ap. Gesner. Thesaur. (t. 3. p. 609.) Linteum ori tergendo paratum. But I do not find either there, or in Facciolati, any authorities from the old classics. We find the word so used by Prudentius, (Peristeph. 1, 86.) Hic sui dat pignus oris, ut ferunt, orarium. Jerome also in his Epistle to Nepotian (Ep. 52. al. 2. n. 9.) uses the term in the same sense, coupling it with *sudarium*. Ed.]

[31] Quæst. 46. t. 4. (t. 3. append. p. 60 b.) Quasi non hodie diaconi dalmaticis induantur sicut episcopi.

[32] Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox. q. 115. (p. 468 c.) Ἐπειδὴ ἀμφοτέρων ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἀεὶ μεμνῆσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις πτώσεως ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν, δι' ἧς ἐκ τῆς πτώσεως ἀνέστημεν. Διὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἐξ ἡμέραις

of the use of both postures in prayer: 'Forasmuch as we ought to remember both our fall by sin, and the grace of Christ, by which we rise again from our fall: therefore we pray kneeling six days, as a symbol of our fall by sin: but our not kneeling on the Lord's-day is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby through the grace of Christ we are delivered from our sins, and from death, that is mortified thereby.' And this custom took its original from the times of the Apostles, as St. Irenæus says in his Book concerning Easter, wherein he also makes mention of Pentecost, 'during which time we kneel not; because it is of the same nature with the Lord's-day, according to the reason that has been given.' Not long after, Tertullian[32] speaks of it, as an observation, among many others, handed down from ancient tradition. And Cyprian[33] may be supposed to hint it, when he speaks of 'their standing in prayer.' It is mentioned also by Clemens of Alexandria[34], and Peter, bishop of Alexandria[35], who died some years before the Council of Nice. He says, 'We keep the Lord's-day as a day of joy, because then our Lord rose from the dead, and our tradition is not to kneel on that day.' In the time of the Council of Nice there was some disagreement about this practice, and therefore that Council made a canon[36] to bring all Churches to an uni-

ἡμῶν γονυκλισία σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις πτώσεως ἡμῶν· τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ μὴ κλίνειν γόνυ, σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως, δι' ἧς τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χάριτι, τῶν τε ἁμαρτημάτων, καὶ τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τεθανατωμένου θανάτου ἠλευθερώθημεν. Ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δὲ χρόνων ἡ τοιαύτη συνήθεια ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχὴν, καθώς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος, ὁ μάρτυς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Λουγδούνου, ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα λόγῳ, ἐν ᾧ μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλίνομεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Κυριακῆς, κατὰ τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν περὶ αὐτῆς αἰτίαν.

[32] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

[33] De Orat. p. 152. (p. 107.) Quando autem stamus ad orationem, &c.

[34] Stromat. 7. (p. 854. 6.) *Ταύτῃ καὶ προσανατείνομεν τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανὸν αἴρομεν, τούς τε πόδας ἐπεγείρομεν κατὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τῆς εὐχῆς συνεκφώνησιν, ἐπακολουθοῦντες τῇ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος εἰς τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν· καὶ συναφιστάνειν τῷ λόγῳ τὸ σῶμα τῆς γῆς πειρώμενοι, μετάρσιον ποιησάμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπτερωμένην τῷ πόθῳ τῶν κρειττόνων, ἐπὶ τὰ ἅγια χωρεῖν βιαζόμεθα, τοῦ δεσμοῦ καταμεγαλοφρονοῦντες τοῦ σαρκικοῦ.*

[35] C. 15. (CC. t. 1. p. 968 c.) *Κυριακὴν δὲ χαρμοσύνης ἡμέραν ἄγομεν, διὰ τὸν ἀναστάντα ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐν ᾗ οὐδὲ γόνατα κλίνειν παρειλήφαμεν.* [*Κυριακὴν*, according to Beveridge, (Pandect. t. 2. p. 23.); but Labbe reads, *Τὴν δὲ Παρασκευὴν, κ. τ. λ.*, omitting the word *Κυριακὴν* and noting in the margin, *Deest hic aliquid in textu Græco.* Ed.]

[36] C. 20. (t. 2. p. 245 c.) *Ἐπειδή τινές εἰσι ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ γόνυ κλίνοντες, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέ-*

formity in this matter. 'Because there are some who kneel on the Lord's-day, and in the days of Pentecost; that all things may be uniformly performed in every parish or diocese, it seems good to the holy synod that prayers be made to God standing.' After this, St. Hilary[37] speaks of it again as an apostolical practice, 'neither to fast, nor worship kneeling on the Lord's-day, or the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost.' Epiphanius[38] says, 'that on the appointed days they prayed kneeling, but during the whole fifty days of Pentecost they neither fasted nor kneeled.' St. Jerom[39] reckons it among the traditions of the universal Church, 'neither to fast nor kneel on the Lord's-day or Pentecost.' St. Austin[40] is a little doubtful as to the practice of the Church Universal, but he assures us, that, as far as he knew, 'all Churches in Afric forbore fasting, and prayed standing, and sung Hallelujah! at the altar every Lord's-day, and all the days of Pentecost, in token of our Saviour's resurrection.' We find the same in St. Basil[41], who derives it from apostolical practice. And Cassian[42] testifies of the Egyptian Churches, that from Saturday night

ραις· ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάντα ὁμοίως ἐν πάσῃ παροικίᾳ ὁμοφρόνως φυλάττεσθαι, ἑστῶτας ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Κυρίῳ [al. *Θεῷ*].

[37] Prolog. in Ps. p. 189. (t. 1. p. 8 d. n. 12.) Et hæc quidem Sabbata Sabbatorum ea ab Apostolis religione celebrata sunt, ut his Quinquagesimæ diebus nullus neque in terram strato corpore adoraret, neque jejunio festivitatem spiritalis hujus beatudinis impediret: quod id ipsum etiam extrinsecus in diebus Dominicis est constitutum, &c.

[38] Expos. Fid. n. 22. (t. 1. p. 1105 a.)... *Δίχα μόνης τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ὅλης τῶν πεντήκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἐν αἷς οὔτε γονυκλησίαι γίνονται, οὔτε νηστεία προστέτακται.*—Ibid. n. 24. (p. 1107 b, c.) *Εὐχὰς δὲ ἐνδελεχῶς προστάσσεται, μετὰ πάσης πυκνότητος, καὶ ἐκτενείας, καὶ γονυκλισίας ἐν ταῖς τεταγμέναις ἡμέραις, νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἀναπέμπειν Θεῷ.*

[39] Dialog. cont. Lucifer. c. 4. [al. c. 8.] (t. 2. p. 180 e.) Die Dominico et per omnem Pentecosten, nec de geniculis adorare, et jejunium solvere.

[40] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 17. (t. 2. p. 141 e.) Ut autem stantes in illis diebus et omnibus Dominicis oremus, utrum ubique servetur ignoro.—Ibid. c. 15. (p. 139 e.) Propter hoc et jejunia relaxantur, et stantes oramus, quod est signum resurrectionis. Unde etiam omnibus diebus Dominicis id ad altare observatur, et halleluia canitur.

[41] De Spirit. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 77 a. n. 66.) *Ὀρθοὶ μὲν πληροῦμεν τὰς εὐχὰς ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ Σαββάτου· τὸν δὲ λόγον οὐ πάντες οἴδαμεν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὡς συναναστάντες Χριστῷ, καὶ τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖν ὀφείλοντες, ἐν τῇ ἀναστασίμῳ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς διδομένης ἡμῖν χάριτος διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν προσευχὴν στάσεως ἑαυτοὺς ὑπομιμνήσκομεν· ἀλλ' ὅτι δοκεῖ πῶς τοῦ προσδοκωμένου αἰῶνος εἶναι εἰκών.*

[42] Instit. l. 2. c. 18. (p. 28.) Hoc quoque nosse debemus, a vespera Sabbati, quæ lucescit in diem Dominicum, usque ad vesperam sequentem apud Ægyptios genua non curvari: sed nec totis quidem Quinquagesimæ diebus, &c.

to Sunday night, and all the days of Pentecost, they neither kneeled nor fasted. And in another place[43] he gives the reason of this, 'because kneeling was a sign of deep repentance and mourning, which they omitted on those days out of respect and reverence to our Saviour's resurrection.' Hence it was that the author of the Constitutions[44] makes it one of his apostolical orders, 'that all men should pray three times, or three prayers, on the Lord's-day *standing*, in memory of him who rose the third day from the dead.' And from hence came that usual form, so often mentioned by St. Chrysostom[45] and others, of the deacons calling upon the people in prayer, *Ὄρθως στῶμεν καλῶς, Let us stand upright with reverence!* alluding to the posture then commonly used in prayer on the Lord's-day.

How long this custom continued in the Church is not easy to determine: but we may observe it to be mentioned by Martin Bracarensis[46] in the sixth century, and the Council of Trullo[47] in the seventh century, and the third Council of Tours[48] in the time of Charles the Great. Nor do we meet with any exception

[43] Collat. l. 21. c. 20. (p. 566.) Ideo . . in istis [al. ipsis] diebus nec [in] genua in oratione curvantur, quia inflexio genuum velut pœnitentiæ ac luctus indicium est. Unde etiam per omnia eandem solemnitatem, quam die Dominica custodimus, . . . ob reverentiam resurrectionis Dominicæ, &c.

[44] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 268.) Ἐν ᾗ καὶ τρὶς [vel τρεῖς] εὐχὰς ἐστῶτες ἐπιτελοῦμεν, μνήμης χάριν τοῦ διὰ τριῶν ἀνάσταντος ἡμερῶν.

[45] Hom. 29. sive 4. de Incomprehens. t. 1. p. 375. See before, ch. 6. s. 1. p. 445. n. 25.—Conf. Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. p. 740. (t. 10. p. 435 d.) . . . Στῶμεν καλῶς, δεηθῶμεν.

[46] Collect. Canon. c. 57. ap. Justel. in append. t. 1. (CC. t. 5. p. 912 a.) Si quis presbyter, propter publicam pœnitentiam a sacerdote acceptam aut aliqua necessitate, die Dominica pro quadam religione jejunaverit, sicut Manichæi, anathema sit. Similiter et quod ab Apostolis traditum canon tenet antiquus, placuit tam per omnes Dominicas, quam per omnes dies Paschæ, usque ad Quinquagesimam, non prostrati nec oratione humiliati, sed erecto vultu ad Dominum orationum fungamur officio, quia in his diebus gaudium resurrectionis Dominicæ celebramus.

[47] C. 90. (t. 6. p. 1179 d.) Ταῖς Κυριακαῖς μὴ γόνυ κλίνειν ἐκ τῶν θεοφόρων ἡμῶν πατέρων κανονικῶς παρελάβομεν, τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τιμῶντες ἀνάστασιν. Ὡς ἂν οὖν μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν τὸ σαφὲς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦτο παρατηρήσεως, δῆλον τοῖς πιστοῖς καθιστῶμεν, ὥστε μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ Σαββάτῳ ἑσπερινὴν τῶν ἱερωμένων πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον εἴσοδον, κατὰ τὸ κρατοῦν ἔθος, μηδένα γόνυ κλίνειν μέχρι τῆς ἐφεξῆς κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἑσπέρας, καθ' ἣν, μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ λυχνικῷ εἴσοδον αὖθις τὰ γόνατα κάμπτοντες, οὕτω τὰς εὐχὰς τῷ Κυρίῳ προσάγομεν.

[48] C. 37. (t. 7. p. 1267 a.) Sciendum est, quod exceptis diebus Dominicis et illis solennitatibus, quibus et universalis ecclesia, ob recordationem Dominicæ resurrectionis solet stando orare, fixis in terra genibus, suppliciter Dei clementiam nobis profuturam, nostrorumque criminum indulgentiam deposcendum est.

to this rule all this time, save only one relating to the penitents, or those that were under the discipline of the Church; who being, by their falling into scandalous sins, reduced to a state of penance, were not allowed this privilege of standing at prayers on the Lord's-day, but were obliged, in token of their humiliation, to kneel at all times, 'not excepting the days of relaxation,' as the fourth Council of Carthage words it in a canon[49] made in this behalf. And so we have seen the concurrent testimony of all writers for the antiquity and universality of this practice.

Secondly, Kneeling at all other times, especially on the stationary days, and other times of devotion.

4. At other times *kneeling* was the most common and ordinary posture of devotion. This may be concluded from the former exception of the Lord's-day and Pentecost from this posture: for that implies, that at other times they used a different posture in their addresses to God. This was the usual posture in their ordinary morning and evening service on the weekly days, and on the stationary or fast-days, which were called *stationary days*, not from their *standing at prayer*, but from their continuing and prolonging the exercise in imitation of *the military stations*. The only difference between these days and the Lord's-day was, that on the Lord's-day all prayers were performed standing, but on other days some were said standing, some kneeling. In this sense we must understand St. Chrysostom[50], when he speaks of 'the people's falling on the ground, when they said the prayer for the whole state of the Church, and their rising again at the bishop's invocation.' And so the author of the Constitutions[51] represents them kneeling at the first prayer, and standing up at the second. In like manner Cassian[52] says 'the people performed

[49] C. 82. (t. 2. p. 1206 c.) Pœnitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectant.

[50] Hom. 18. in 2 Cor. p. 873. (t. 10. p. 568 b.) ... Ἑτέραν δεῖ γενέσθαι εὐχὴν, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμεθα, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἀνιστάμεθα.

[51] L. 8. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 396.) Ὅσοι πιστοὶ, κλίνωμεν γόνυ, δεηθῶμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. —Conf. c. 10. (ibid. p. 397.) Ἐγειρώμεθα, καὶ δεηθέντες ἐκτενῶς ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀλλήλους τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παραθώμεθα.

[52] Instit. l. 2. c. 7. (p. 19.) Post hæc puncto brevissimo procidentes humi, velut adorantes tantam divinam clementiam, summa velocitate consurgunt, ac rursus erecti expansis manibus eodem modo, quo prius stantes oraverant, suis precibus intentius immorantur. Humi namque diutius procumbentem, non solum cogitationibus aiunt, verum etiam somno gravius impugnari. ... Cum autem is, qui orationem collecturus est, e terra surrexerit, omnes pariter

their private prayers kneeling, and then rose up to the minister's collect or prayer, in which all joined standing.' This is to be understood of their prayers on ordinary days, and not of the Lord's-day, on which, as we have seen before, all their prayers were performed standing.

As to the posture of *kneeling* upon other occasions, it would be endless to cite all the testimonies that may be alleged for it. It was so common among them, that the author of the Acts of Thecla[53] gives prayer the name of *κλίσις γονάτων, bending the knees.* And Arnobius, when he would describe to the Heathen the manner of Christians performing their divine office to God, does it by saying[54], 'they all fell down upon the earth, as their custom was, and made their common prayers to him.' Eusebius[55], speaking of the great devotion of St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, says, 'he was wont to go into the temple alone, and there pray assiduously upon his knees, making intercession for the sins of the people, till his knees were grown as hard and callous as those of camels by continual exercise of his devotions.' And so again, speaking of the Thundering Legion, who in the time of Marcus Aurelius procured rain by their prayers, to save the Roman army, and thunder to destroy their enemies, he says[56], 'they fell upon their knees, as was the usual custom of Christians in their prayers, and so made their supplications to God at the head of the army as it was going forth to the battle.' Tertullian had his eye upon this very story, when he tells Scapula[57] 'that the geniculations, (or prayers on the bended knee,) together with the fastings of Christians, were always effectual in driving away drought and famine.'

eriguntur, ita ut nullus, nec antequam inclinetur ille, genu flectere, nec cum e terra surrexerit, remorari præsumat, &c.

53 Ap. Grabe, Spicileg. (t. 1. p. 96.) Εἰσελθόντος τοῦ Παύλου εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ὀνησιφόρου, ἐγένετο χαρὰ μεγάλη, καὶ κλίσις γονάτων, καὶ κλάσις ἄρτου, κ. τ. λ.

54 Cont. Gent. l. 1. p. 25. (p. 14.) ... Hic propositus terminus divinorum officiorum, hic finis, huic omnes ex more prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus.

55 L. 2. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 78. 12.) Καὶ μόνος εἰσήρχετο εἰς τὸν ναόν· ηὐρίσκετό τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι, καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἄφεσιν· ὡς ἀπεσκληκέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ, δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν ἐπὶ γόνυ προσκυνοῦντα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ.

56 L. 5. c. 5. (ibid. p. 215. 4.) ... Ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους παρατάξει γόνυ θέντας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν κατὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἡμῖν τῶν εὐχῶν ἔθος, ἐπὶ τὰς τὸν Θεὸν ἱκεσίας τραπέσθαι.

57 C. 4. (p. 71 b.) Quando non geniculationibus et jejunationibus nostris etiam siccitates sunt depulsæ?

It were easy to give a thousand other instances of the like practice out of the ancient writers[58]; but in a case so clear and uncontested, I think it next to impertinence to trouble my reader with them. I only note, that though these two postures of prayer were very indifferent in their own nature, yet it was always esteemed an instance of great negligence or great perverseness to interchange them unseasonably one for the other: that is, to pray kneeling on the Lord's-day, when the Church required standing; or standing on other days, when the rules and custom of the Church required men to kneel. And therefore as the canons of Nice and Trullo reflect upon those who were superstitiously bent upon kneeling on the Lord's-day; so others with equal severity complain of the remissness and negligence of such as refused to kneel at other times, when the Church appointed it. 'It is a very indecent and irregular thing,' says Cæsarius of Arles[59], 'that when the deacon cries out, Let us bend the knee! the people should then stand erect as pillars in the church.' These were but small observations in themselves, but of great consequence, we see, when done perversely to the scandal and disorder of the Church, whose great rule in all such cases is that of the Apostle, [1 Cor. 14, 40.] "Let all things be done decently and in order."

Thirdly, Bowing down the head.

5. A third posture of devotion was *bowing down the head*, or an inclination of the body between the posture of standing

[58] Herm. Past. part. 1. vis. 1. n. 1. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 75.) Genibus positis cœpi orare Dominum.—Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. ad Cor. n. 48. (Cotel. ibid. p. 174.) *Προσπέσωμεν τῷ Δεσπότῃ, καὶ κλαύσωμεν ἱκετεύοντες αὐτὸν, ὅπως ἵλεως γενόμενος ἐπικαταλλαγῇ ἡμῖν.*—Pass. Ignat. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 176.) Cum genuflexione omnium fratrum .... subductus est cum festinatione in amphitheatrum etc.—Pass. Cypr. p. 13. (p. 14. ult. lin.) .... Et genu in terra flexit, et in orationem se Domino prostravit.—Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 61. (v. 1. p. 661. 6. .... *Γόνυ κλίνας ἐπ' ἐδάφους, ἱκέτης ἐγίγνετο τοῦ Θεοῦ.*—August. de Civitat. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. (t. 7. p. 665 f.) .... Ubi nobis ex more genua figentibus atque incumbentibus terræ, ille se ita projecit, tanquam fuisset aliquo impellente graviter prostratus, et cœpit orare.—Chrysost. Hom. 22. de Ira, t. 1. p. 278. [Ed. Bened. ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 20.] (t. 2. p. 200 d.) .... *Καὶ τῶν γονάτων σου χαμαὶ κειμένων, πολλαχοῦ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῆς οἰκίας πλανᾶσθαί σου τὴν διάνοιαν ἐᾷς.*—Prudent. Cathemer. Hymn. 2. vv. 49–52. (v. 1. p. 64.)

Te mente pura et simplici,
Te voce, te cantu pio,
Rogare curvato genu,
Flendo et canendo, discimus.

[59] Hom. 34. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 853 b. 5.) Nam dum frequenter, sicut oportet et diligenter attendo, diacono clamante, Flectamus genua! maximam partem populi, velut columnas, erectos stare conspicui: quod Christianis, dum in ecclesia oratur, omnino nec licet, nec expedit.

and kneeling. This was chiefly used in receiving the bishop's or priest's benedictions, in all direct and formal addresses to God for his mercy and favour upon the people, whether catechumens, penitents, or any other. Thus we find in the Constitutions the catechumens[60] are bid to 'bow the head in order to receive the bishop's benediction in a form of invocation,' there appointed to be said over them. So likewise the energumens[61] have the same direction: 'Bow down your heads, ye energumens, and receive the benediction.' In like manner the candidates of baptism[62] and the penitents[63] are bid to rise up, after the deacon's prayer, and 'bow their heads to receive the benediction.' And this may be confirmed out of Chrysostom[64], who says, 'the deacon in the time of the oblation presented the energumens, and bid them bow their heads only, to indicate at least by the habit and gesture of the body, that they were in a praying posture.' And this he repeats[65] in other places, where he particularly speaks of those that were possessed of evil spirits.

Fourthly, Prostration.

6. The last posture of devotion was *prostration*, or lying along in the humblest manner upon the ground. This seems to have been the proper posture for extraordinary humiliations, when men had some singular request more earnestly to recommend to God. We often read of Moses and other saints falling upon their faces in Scripture, when they were to make some extraordinary intercession for the sins of the people. And in imitation of them the same gesture was sometimes used in the Christian Church. Some lapsers, when they sued for admission to a state of penance, did not only fall down upon their knees, but prostrated themselves before the faithful, to beg their prayers as they entered into the church. Which is particularly

[60] L. 8. c. 6. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 393.) *Κλινόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς, εὐλογείτω αὐτοὺς ὁ χειροτονηθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος εὐλογίαν τοιάνδε· Ὁ Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ, κ. τ. λ.*

[61] Ibid. (p. 394.) *Κλίνατε οἱ ἐνεργούμενοι, καὶ εὐλογεῖσθε.*

[62] Ibid. c. 7. (p. 394.) *Κατασφραγισάμενοι τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, κλίναντες εὐλογείσθωσαν παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.*

[63] Ibid. c. 8. (p. 395.) *Ἀναστάντες . . . . κλίνατε καὶ εὐλογεῖσθε.*

[64] Hom. 28. sive 3. de Incomprehens. t. 1. p. 365. (t. 1. p. 470 e.) *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοὺς ἐνεργουμένους κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἵστησι τὸν καιρὸν ὁ διάκονος, καὶ κελεύει κλῖναι τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνον, καὶ τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖσθαι ἱκετηρίας.*

[65] Hom. 29. t. 1. p. 374. (ibid. p. 477 b.) *Ἔσται δὲ ἡ χάρις, ἂν διδάξωμεν ὑμᾶς, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἐκείνη γίνεται πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἡ εὐχὴ, καὶ τί δήποτε τοὺς δαιμονῶντας, καὶ τῇ μανίᾳ πονηρᾷ κατεχομένους εἰσάγεσθαι κελεύει τότε ὁ διάκονος, καὶ κλίνειν τὰς κεφαλάς.*

noted by Socrates[66] of Ecebolius the sophist, who, having lapsed in the time of Julian, desired favour under Jovian; and the more to move compassion, he put himself into the mournfullest posture, falling upon his face before the gate of the church, and crying out, *Calcate me insipidum salem! Tread me under foot as salt that has lost its savour!*

But this was not the only case in which they used this mournful posture, but they also practised it upon other occasions, whenever any great necessity urged them with greater ardency to prefer their petitions to God. Thus Socrates[67] observes of Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, that when he was in a great strait about the admission of Arius into the church he prostrated himself upon his face under the communion table, and there prayed to God for many days and nights together, that God would give some token to determine which of their doctrine was true: if the doctrine of Arius was true, he desired that he himself might not live to see the day appointed for the disputation: but if his own were true, then he desired that Arius might suffer the punishment due to his impiety. Which he accordingly did, voiding his entrails as he had occasion to go to stool, whilst he was going triumphantly to the church. Theodoret[68] makes a like remark upon the behaviour of Theodosius the Great, that when he first entered the church, after he had been for some time excluded by St. Ambrose, he would neither pray to God standing nor kneeling, but prostrate with his face to the ground; using those words of the Psalmist, [119, 25.] "My soul cleaveth to the dust, O quicken thou me according to thy word." By which we learn, that this posture was chiefly appropriated to deep humiliations, and expressions of shame or sorrow upon some very remarkable occasion, but scarce ever used as a general practice of the Church.

7. There is one posture more, which some plead for as a

Sitting, not an allowed

[66] L. 3. c. 13. (v. 2. p. 188. 28.) Ῥίψας γὰρ ἑαυτὸν πρηνῆ πρὸ τῆς πύλης τοῦ εὐκτηρίου οἴκου, Πατήσατέ με, ἐβόα, τὸ ἅλας τὸ ἀναίσθητον.

[67] L. 1. c. 37. (ibid. p. 73. 49.)... Ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ στόμα ἐκτείνας εὔχεται, κ. τ. λ.

[68] L. 5. c. 18. al. 19. (v. 3. p. 217. 36.) Οὕτως ὁ πιστότατος βασιλεὺς εἴσω γενέσθαι θαρρήσας τοῦ θείου νεὼ, οὐχ ἑστὼς τὸν Δεσπότην ἱκέτευεν, οὐδὲ τὰ γόνατα κλίνας· ἀλλὰ, πρηνὴς ἐπὶ τοῦ δαπέδου κείμενος, τὴν Δαυϊτικὴν ἀφῆκε φωνὴν, Ἐκολλήθη τῷ ἐδάφει ἡ ψυχή μου· ζῆσόν με κατὰ τὸν λόγον σου.

posture of devotion.

posture of adoration; but it never had any allowance in the practice of the ancient Church: that is, *sitting,* which Cardinal Perron and some others in the Romish Church pretend was the posture in which the Apostles received the communion at its first institution, and that this was then a common posture of adoration used among the Heathens. But the learned Mr. Daille[69] has abundantly exposed this pretence, and showed the falsity of it in every particular. For neither did the Heathens sit at their devotions, as the Cardinal imposed upon himself by a false interpretation of Plutarch and Tertullian; neither did the Apostles communicate sitting, but lying along on beds or couches, which all men know to be a different posture; neither did they worship the eucharist in any posture; neither did the primitive Christians ever use or take sitting for a posture of devotion.

Tertullian[70] indeed says there were some superstitious persons in his time, admirers of the book called Hermes Pastor, who made it a matter of conscience to sit down for some time, *assignata oratione,* that is, not *in time of prayer,* as some falsely render it, but *when prayer was ended,* because they found the example of the Pastor in that book to that purpose. For as he sat down upon a bed after prayer, so they thought themselves obliged to do the same in compliance with his example. But this is no proof of their sitting at prayer, but only after prayer was ended: and that too grounded upon a very weak and superstitious opinion, that every circumstance of an action or narration, however indifferent in itself, was to be drawn into example, and to be made matter of necessary duty. According to which way of reasoning, as Tertullian[71] observes, 'they must have worshipped

[69] De Object. Cult. Relig. 2. c. 2. (pp. 225 seqq.) Id vidit Perronius &c.

[70] De Orat. c. 12. (p. 134 a.) Item, quod assignata oratione assidendi mos est quibusdam, non perspicio rationem, nisi si Hermas ille, cujus scriptura fere Pastor inscribitur, transacta oratione non super lectum assedisset, verum aliud quid fecisset, id quoque ad observationem vindicaremus. Utique non. Simpliciter enim et nunc positum est, Cum adorassem et assedissem super lectum, ad ordinem narrationis, non ad instar disciplinæ. Alioquin nusquam erit adorandum, nisi ubi fuerit lectus. Immo contra scripturam fecerit, si quis in cathedra aut subsellio sederit.

[71] De Orat. c. 12. (p. 134 b.) Porro cum perinde faciant nationes, adoratis sigillaribus suis residendo, vel propterea in nobis reprehendi meretur, quod apud idola celebratur. Eo apponitur et irreverentiæ crimen, etiam ipsis nationibus, si quid sape-

nowhere but where there was a bed, nor sat upon a chair or bench, because this would have been a deviation from their example.' He adds, 'that the Heathens only were used to sit after prayer before their idols, and for that very reason it was not fit for Christians to imitate their practice.' All which shows that the Christians then were so far from using sitting as a posture of devotion, that they did not think it proper to sit even after prayer in the presence of God, 'whilst the angel of prayer, (it is his phrase,) stood by them;' and because it looked more like an heathenish than a Christian practice.

Some superstitious practices in devotion noted by Tertullian.

8. Tertullian in the same book takes notice of some other superstitious observations, which some ran into in their devotions, in imitation of the Heathen. Some thought it necessary to put off their cloaks when they went to prayer, which he condemns as symbolizing with idolaters. For so the Heathen were used to do in reverence to their idols[72]: this 'was superstition, not religion; and more an affectation and curiosity, than any thing of rational and manly service.' Others[73] 'would not pray without washing the whole body in water, as if that made them more acceptable to God; whereas the true purity was that of the spirit, to lift up holy hands free from deceit, murder, cruelty, witchcraft, idolatry, and other such corruptions, which defile both flesh and spirit. A man,

rent, intelligendum. Siquidem irreverens est assidere sub conspectu contraque conspectum ejus, quem quam maxime reverearis ac venereris: quanto magis sub conspectu Dei vivi, angelo adhuc orationis adstante, factum istud irreligiosum est, nisi exprobramus Deo, quod nos oratio fatigaverit?

72 Ibid. (a.) Hujusmodi enim non religioni, sed superstitioni deputantur, affectata et coacta, et curiosi potius quam rationalis officii, certe vel eo coercenda, quod gentilibus adæquent. Ut est quorundam expositis [al. positis] penulis orationem facere: sic enim adeunt ad idola nationes.

73 Ibid. c. 11. (p. 133 c.) ... Quæ ratio est, manibus quidem ablutis, spiritu vero sordente, orationem obire? Quando et ipsis manibus spiritales munditiæ sunt necessariæ, ut a falso, a cæde, a sævitia, a veneficiis, ab idololatria, cæterisque maculis, quæ spiritu conceptæ manuum opera transiguntur, puræ alleventur. Hæ sunt veræ munditiæ, non quas plerique superstitiose curant, ad omnem orationem etiam cum lavacro totius corporis aquam sumentes. Id cum scrupulose percontarer, et rationem requirerem, comperi commemorationem esse in Domini deditionem. Nos Dominum adoramus, non dedimus, immo et adversari debemus deditoris exemplo, nec propterea manus abluere, nisi quod conversationis humanæ inquinamentum, conscientiæ causa, lavemus. Cæterum satis mundæ sunt manus, quas cum toto corpore in Christo semel lavimus. Omnibus licet membris lavet quotidie Israël, nunquam tamen mundus est.

that is free from these is always clean, being once washed in the blood of Christ: but he, that is inwardly polluted, is unclean, though he wash every member of his body every day.'

It is the superstition of these practices that Tertullian complains of: for otherwise, the Christians themselves had their fountains before the church, in many places, for men to wash their hands, as a matter of decency, before they went to worship God, as has been shown in another place[74]. And the evil of such practices consists not in the bare use of such things, but in laying the opinion of necessity upon them, and affixing holiness to the usage, and making them become essential parts of divine service.

That the Ancients uncovered their heads in their devotions.

9. Such practices therefore, as were attended with superstition, they disclaimed; but retained such other rites and ceremonies, as were either proper expressions of decency in their own nature, or by their significancy and symbolical use might be improved to a spiritual advantage. They prayed with the head uncovered, according to the Apostle's direction, as esteeming it a great indecency to do otherwise. So Chrysostom[75] in his comment on the place. Tertullian adds another reason in his Apology to the Gentiles[76], 'We pray uncovered, because we are not ashamed to appear with open face; making it a sort of testimony and symbol of their innocency in their addressing God without covering.' On the other hand, as both nature and custom had made it decent for women to be covered, so they were very precise in requiring this to be observed, especially in religious assemblies. Some pleaded an exemption for virgins in the case, which gave occasion to Tertullian to write his book *De Velandis Virginibus*, wherein[77] he argues both virgins and matrons to be under the same obligation of being veiled or covered in time of divine service; and he severely inveighs against those who hanged a fringe or ribbon about their heads, and pretended to call that a covering. But some learned persons[78] think he was too severe in this re-

[74] B. 8. ch. 3. s. 6. v. 3. p. 56.

[75] [Hom. 26. in 1 Cor. (t. 10. p. 232 b.) Τὸν μὲν οὖν ἄνδρα οὐκ ἀεὶ ἀναγκάζει ἀκατακάλυπτον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅταν εὔχηται μόνον. *Grischov.*]

[76] C. 30. (p. 27 b.) ..... Capite nudo, quia non erubescimus, precantes sumus semper, &c.

[77] C. 17. (p. 182 d.) Quantam autem castigationem merebuntur etiam illæ, quæ inter psalmos, vel in quacunque Dei mentione, retectæ perseverant? &c.

[78] Du Pin. Bibliothéque, t. 1.

flection, and almost singular in applying it to the case of virgins, who were then allowed a greater liberty in this matter above matrons or married women, by the general discipline of the African Church.

And lifted up their hands toward heaven, sometimes in the form of a cross.

10. It is more uncontested, what Tertullian[79] observes of another ceremony, that they usually prayed with their arms expanded and their hands lift up to heaven, and that sometimes in the form of a cross, to represent our Saviour's passion. For this is also noted by Minucius[80], when he says, 'they worshipped God with a pure mind, and their hands stretched forth in the form of a cross.' And by Asterius Amasenus, in a fragment of his Homily concerning Prayer, preserved in Photius[81], who says, 'the Christian represents the passion of the cross by his gesture, whilst he expands his arms and lifts them up in the figure of a cross.' After this manner Paulinus[82] describes St. Ambrose in his last minutes praying to God, 'with his hands expanded in the form of a cross.' And Prudentius[83] relating the Passion of Fructuosus, a Spanish bishop and martyr, in the time of Gallienus, says, 'the bands which tied his arms, were

p. 95. (t. 1. p. 103.) Il ne faut pas l'entendre seulement des verges consacrées à Dieu; car le but de Tertullien est de prouver dans cet ouvrage, qu'il faut que les filles soient voilées, c'est-à-dire, qu'elles aient le visage couvert dans l'église, ce qu'il entreprend de montrer contre la coûtume de son pais, où il n'y avoit que les femmes mariées qui se voilassent. [Libri de Velandis Virginibus titulo notum est argumentum; at id de virginibus Deo consecratis non modo venit intelligendum; in eo enim opere Tertulliano animus est probare, velandas esse virgines, h. e. vultu velato esse in ecclesia, quod contra patriæ suæ morem demonstrandum suscepit, in qua solæ nuptæ velabantur. Idcirco contra morem loquitur et eum contra veritatem præscribere non posse contendit; quod verum est, quum agitur de dogmate, non vero quum de disciplina parvi momenti. *Grischov.*]

[79] Apol. c. 30. (p. 27 b.). . Manibus exspansis, quia innocuis, &c.—De Orat. c. 11. (p. 133 d.) Nos vero non attollimus tantum, sed etiam expandimus, et Dominica passione modulatum [al. et Dominica passione modulantes], et orantes confitemur Christo.

[80] Octav. c. 29. p. 90. (p. 150.) . . . Crucis signum est, et cum homo porrectis manibus Deum pura mente veneratur.

[81] Biblioth. cod. 271. (p. 1496. 4.) . . . *Ἐκτεταμένας προβαλλόμενος τὰς χεῖρας τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάθος ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξικονίζει.*

[82] Vit. Ambros. p. 12. (t. 2. præfix. append. p. 12 e. n. 47.) . . . Ab hora undecima diei usque ad illam horam, qua emisit spiritum, expansis manibus in modum crucis oravit.

[83] Peristeph. Hymn. 6. in Fructuos. vv. 103. 108. (v. 1. p. 283.)

Nexus denique, qui manus retrorsum
In tergum revocaverant revinctas,
Intacta cute decidunt adusti.
Non ausa est cohibere pœna palmas,
In morem crucis ad Patrem levandas,
Solvit brachia, quæ Deum precentur.

first burnt off without touching his skin; for they durst not restrain those arms, which were to be lifted up to the Father in the manner of a cross.' And this probably is St. Chrysostom's meaning, when he says[84], 'the sign of the cross was used even by the Emperors upon all occasions, on their purple, on their diadems, in their prayers, on their arms, and at the holy table.' And in reference to this gesture it is, that Eusebius[85] tells us, that Constantine ordered his own image to be stamped on his golden medals, representing him in the posture of a supplicant, looking up to heaven, with his arms stretched forth to God. Origen[86] says, 'this was to represent the lifting up of their hearts to God in the heavens.' And Chrysostom[87] more largely sets forth the use of it in explaining those words of the Psalmist, [141, 2.] "Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice." 'What means,' says he, 'the stretching forth our hands in prayer? Because they are instrumental in many sorts of wickedness, as fighting, murder, robbery, and rapacious avarice, therefore we are commanded to lift them up, that the ministry of prayer may tie them up from vice, and deliver

[84] Demonstr. quod Christus sit Deus, c. 8. t. 5. p. 838. (t. 1. p. 569 d.) Ἐν πορφυρίσι σταυρὸς, ἐν διαδήμασι σταυρὸς, ἐπὶ εὐχῶν σταυρὸς, ἐπὶ ὅπλων σταυρὸς, ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης τῆς ἱερᾶς σταυρὸς, κ. τ. λ.

[85] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 15. (t. 1. p. 634. 12.) ... Ὡς ἐν τοῖς χρυσοῖς νομίσμασι τὴν αὐτοῦ αὐτὸς εἰκόνα ὧδε γράφεσθαι διετύπου· ὡς ἄνω βλέπειν δοκεῖν, ἀνατεταμένος πρὸς θεὸν, τρόπον εὐχομένου.

[86] Περὶ Εὐχῆς, n. 20. [juxt. Ed. Oxon. 8vo. juxt. Ed. Bened. n. 9. tot.] (t. 1. pp. 210 f, seqq.) Ἐπαιρεῖν δεῖ ὁσίας χεῖρας τὸν εὐχόμενον, κ.τ.λ. —[Conf. etiam, n. 31. (ibid. p. 267 c.) Οὐδὲ διστάσαι γὰρ χρὴ, ὅτι μυρίων καταστάσεων οὐσῶν τοῦ σώματος, τὴν κατάστασιν τὴν μετ' ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν, κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[87] In Ps. 140. p. 550. (t. 5. p. 431 c.) Ἀλλὰ γὰρ τί βούλεται καὶ τῶν χειρῶν ἡ ἔκτασις ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ; ἐπειδὴ πολλαῖς πονηρίαις διακονοῦνται αὗται, οἷον πληγαῖς, φόνοις, ἁρπαγαῖς, πλεονεξίαις, δι' αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο κελευόμεθα αὐτὰς ἀνατείνειν, ἵνα ἡ τῆς εὐχῆς διακονία δεσμὸς αὐταῖς γένηται τῆς κακίας, καὶ ἀπαλλαγὴ τῆς πονηρίας, ἵν' ὅταν μέλλῃς ἁρπάζειν, ἢ πλεονεκτεῖν, ἢ τύπτειν ἕτερον, ἀναμνησθεὶς ὅτι ταύτας μέλλεις ἀντὶ συνηγόρων πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν πέμπειν, καὶ διὰ τούτων τὴν θυσίαν ἀναπέμπειν ἐκείνην τὴν πνευματικὴν, μὴ καταισχύνῃς αὐτὰς, καὶ ἀπαρρησιάστους ἐργάσῃ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς πονηρᾶς ἐργασίας. Κάθαιρε τοίνυν αὐτὰς ἐλεημοσύνῃ, φιλανθρωπίᾳ, προστασίᾳ δεομένων, καὶ οὕτως αὐτὰς εἰς εὐχὴν ἄγε. Εἰ γὰρ ἀνίπτους αὐτὰς οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεις εἰς εὐχὴν ἐπαίρεσθαι, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἁμαρτήμασιν οὐκ ἂν εἴης δίκαιος αὐτὰς μιαίνειν.—Conf. Clem. Alexandr. Strom. 7. (p. 854. 7.) Ταύτῃ καὶ προσανατείνομεν τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανὸν αἴρομεν, τούς τε πόδας ἐπεγείρομεν κατὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τῆς εὐχῆς συνεκφώνησιν, ἐπακολουθοῦντες τῇ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος εἰς τὴν νοητὴν οὐσίαν· καὶ συναφιστάνειν τῷ λόγῳ τὸ σῶμα τῆς γῆς πειρώμενοι, μετάρσιον ποιησάμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπτερωμένην τῷ πόθῳ τῶν κρειττόνων, ἐπὶ τὰ ἅγια χωρεῖν βιαζόμεθα, τοῦ δεσμοῦ καταμεγαλοφρονοῦντες τοῦ σαρκικοῦ.

them from wickedness: that when you are inclined to rob, or plunder, or smite your neighbour, you should then remember, that these hands are the advocates, as it were, which you are to send forth to God, and by which you are to offer the spiritual sacrifice of prayer to him; and therefore you ought not to dishonour them, and destroy their confidence by letting them minister to wicked actions; but rather cleanse them by alms-deeds and humanity and assistance of those that are in want, and so lift them up to God in prayer. For if you cannot endure to lift up unwashed hands, how much less should you think it meet to defile them with sin!'

By all this it appears that these ceremonies, both of *washing hands*, and *lifting them up in prayer*, were of spiritual use, and designed for pious ends, to put men in mind of internal purity by external symbols, and that this significancy was the chief thing that could justify and account for the use of them, as ceremonies in divine service.

But yet were great enemies to all theatrical gestures.

11. But as they allowed of such decent and significant ceremonies as those that have been mentioned, so they were great enemies to all light and theatrical gestures. They required a modest and grave and well composed behaviour in all external deportment, as thinking no other becoming the majesty of God, or the character of those that were to address him. Upon this account Tertullian[88] requires 'a modesty and humility in his votaries even in lifting up their hands in prayer, that they should not toss them up indecently on high, nor appear with a countenance expressing elation and boldness: because the Publican's humility and dejection were more commendable than the audaciousness of the Pharisee. He requires also a gentle and submissive voice, since God did not hear men for the sound of their words, or the strength of their lungs or arteries, but the fervency of their hearts: and they that were loud in prayer,'

[88] De Orat. c. 13. (p. 134 b.) Atqui cum modestia et humilitate adorantes magis commendabimus Deo preces nostras, ne ipsis quidem manibus sublimius elatis, sed temperate ac probe elatis. Ne vultu quidem in audaciam erecto. Nam ille Publicanus, qui non tantum prece, sed et vultu humiliatus atque dejectus orabat, justificatior Pharisæo procacissimo discessit. Sonos etiam vocis subjectos esse oportet, aut quantis arteriis opus est, si pro sono audiamur? Deus autem non vocis, sed cordis auditor est, sicut conspector..... Quid amplius referent isti, qui clarius adorant, nisi quod proximis obstrepunt?

he tells them, 'did nothing else but hinder their neighbours' devotion.' St. Cyprian[89] expresses himself much after the same way in his directions about the manner of praying: 'Let them that pray,' says he, 'do it with an orderly voice, expressing quietness and modesty. Let us consider ourselves as standing in the sight of God, and that we are to please the divine eyes both with the habit or gesture of our body, and with the manner of our voice. For as it is a sign of an impudent man to make a clamorous noise, so it becomes a modest man to use modesty in his prayers. Therefore when we meet together with our brethren, and celebrate the divine sacrifices with the priest of God, we ought to be mindful of reverence and discipline; not tossing out our prayers with a rude and disorderly voice, nor with a tumultuous loquacity pouring forth these petitions, which ought to be recommended modestly to God. For God is not the hearer of the voice, but of the heart: neither needs he to be reminded by noise and clamour, who sees the thoughts of men.'

It appears from these cautions, that men were apt to run into disorders and excesses in the manner of expressing the external part of their devotions, which needed such rules and admonitions to direct them in the purest ages. And it appears yet more from St. Chrysostom, who has several sharp and severe invectives against some, who accustoming themselves to see the Roman games and plays, brought the manners of the stage into the church, and corrupted their devotions with theatrical gestures. It will be sufficient to relate a few words out of a single passage in one of his Homilies[90] to this purpose.

[89] De Orat. Dom. p. 148. (p. 99.) Sit autem orantibus sermo et precatio cum disciplina quietem continens et pudorem. Cogitemus nos sub conspectu Dei stare: placendum est divinis oculis et habitu corporis, et modo vocis. Nam ut impudentis est clamoribus strepere, ita contra congruit verecundo modestis precibus orare.... Quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus, et sacrificia divina cum Dei sacerdote celebramus, verecundiæ et disciplinæ memores esse debemus: non passim ventilare preces nostras inconditis vocibus: nec petitionem, commendandam modeste Deo, tumultuosa loquacitate jactare. Quia Deus non vocis, sed cordis auditor est. Nec admonendus est clamoribus, qui cogitationes hominum videt, &c.

[90] Hom. 1. de Verb. Esai. t. 3. p. 836. (B. t. 6. p. 97 b.) Ἄθλιε καὶ ταλαίπωρε, δέον σε δεδοικότα καὶ τρέμοντα τὴν ἀγγελικὴν δοξολογίαν ἐκπέμπειν, φόβῳ τε τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν τῷ Κτίστῃ ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ διὰ ταύτης συγγνώμην τῶν ἐπταισμένων αἰτεῖσθαι. Σὺ δὲ τὰ μίμων καὶ ὀρχηστῶν ἐνταῦθα παράγεις, ἀτάκτως μὲν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπανατείνων, καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἐφαλλόμενος, καὶ ὅλῳ περικυκλώμενος

'O unhappy wretch,' says he, 'thou oughtest with reverence and fear to send up the angelical hymn, and with trembling make confession to God, and thereby ask pardon of thy offences. Instead of this thou bringest into the church the manners of mimics and dancers, by a disorderly tossing up of thy hands, and beating with thy feet, and agitation of thy whole body. Dost thou not consider that the Lord himself is present, who measures every man's motions, and examines their consciences? Dost thou not consider, that the angels stand by this tremendous table, and surround it with fear? But thou considerest none of these things, because thy mind is blinded with what thou hast heard and seen in the theatres; and the things which are done there, thou bringest into the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and with insignificant clamours bewrayest the disorder of thy soul. How canst thou expect to incline God to mercy, who offerest thy prayer with such contempt? Thou sayest, Lord have mercy on me! whilst thy behaviour proclaims itself a stranger to mercy: thou criest out, Lord save me! whilst the whole deportment of thy body is in opposition to salvation. For what can those hands, which are always tossed up on high, and disorderly rolled about, contribute toward prayer? What use can there be in vehement cla-

τῷ σώματι· καὶ πῶς οὐ δέδοικας, οὐδὲ φρίττεις τοιούτων κατατολμῶν λογίων; Οὐκ ἐννοεῖς, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἀοράτως ἐνταῦθα πάρεστιν ὁ Δεσπότης, καὶ ἑκάστου τὴν κίνησιν ἀναμετρεῖ, καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς ἐξετάζει; Οὐκ ἐννοεῖς, ὅτι ἄγγελοι ταύτῃ τῇ φρικτῇ παρίστανται τραπέζῃ, καὶ φόβῳ ταύτην περιέπουσιν; Ἀλλὰ σὺ ταῦτα οὐ κατανοεῖς, ἐπειδὴ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις ἀκουσμάτων τε καὶ θεαμάτων τὸν νοῦν συνεσκοτίσθης, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἐκεῖσε πραττόμενα τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναφέρεις τύποις. Διὰ τοῦτο ταῖς ἀσήμοις κραυγαῖς τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄτακτον δημοσιεύεις. Πῶς οὖν συγγνώμην ἐξαιτήσῃ τῶν οἰκείων ἁμαρτημάτων; πῶς εἰς οἶκτον ἐπισπάσῃ τὸν Δεσπότην, οὕτω καταπεφρονημένως τὴν δέησιν προτεινόμενος; Ἐλέησόν με, ὁ Θεὸς, λέγεις, καὶ τοῦ ἐλέους ἀλλότριον τὸ ἦθος ἐπιδείκνυσαι. Σῶσόν με, βοᾷς, καὶ ξένον τῆς σωτηρίας τὸ σχῆμα διατυποῖς. Τί συντείνουσι προς ἱκεσίαν χεῖρες ἐπὶ μετεωρισμῷ συνεχῶς ἐπαιρόμεναι, καὶ ἀτάκτως περιφερόμεναι, κραυγή τε σφοδρὰ, καὶ τῇ βιαίᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος ὠθήσει τὸ ἄσημον ἔχουσα; Οὐχὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς τριόδοις ἑταιριζομένων γυναικῶν, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις φωνούντων ἐστὶν ἔργα; Πῶς οὖν τολμᾷς τῇ ἀγγελικῇ ταύτῃ δοξολογίᾳ τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων ἀναμιγνύειν παίγνια;—Conf. Hom. 19. in Matth. p. 195. (t. 7. p. 247 e.) *Ἀλλ' ὅμως εἰσί τινες, οἱ μετὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ τοσαῦτα παραγγέλματα οὕτως ἀσχημονοῦντες ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ, ὡς καὶ τοῦ σώματος κρυπτομένου διὰ τῆς φωνῆς πᾶσι καταδήλους ἑαυτοὺς ποιεῖν, συρφετωδῶς βοῶντες, καὶ τῷ σχήματι καὶ τῇ φωνῇ καταγελάστους ποιοῦντες ἑαυτούς. . . . Μὴ τοίνυν τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σώματος, μηδὲ τῇ κραυγῇ τῆς φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ τῇ προθυμίᾳ τῆς γνώμης τὰς εὐχὰς ποιώμεθα· μήτε μετὰ ψόφου καὶ ἠχῆς, καὶ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν, ὡς καὶ τοὺς πλησίον ἐγκρούειν· ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἐπιεικείας πάσης καὶ τῆς κατὰ διάνοιαν συντριβῆς, καὶ δακρύων τῶν ἔνδοθεν.*

mour, and violent impulse of spirit, that has nothing in it but sound and noise without signification? These are more the practices of strumpets on the high way, or actors on the theatre. And how darest thou to mingle the sports of devils with that doxology, whereby angels glorify God?' Thus far St. Chrysostom in his warmth and zeal against the corruptions that were creeping in upon devotion by absurd and ridiculous gestures. And this shows us abundantly, that as the Ancients were no way averse to any rites and ceremonies, habits or gestures, that were decent and significant in their own nature, and had any real tendency toward piety; so they were utter enemies to such as were insignificant and trivial, light and theatrical, and discountenanced them as the effects of superstition or vanity, arising from misapprehensions of religion or evil customs of the world, which they laboured to extirpate, but could not always conquer; men's corrupt inclinations disposing them to commute the great things of religion for those that were small in comparison, and sometimes for those which were a real detriment and disadvantage to it, as in the cases now before us.

Of ceremonies used at their entrance into the church.

12. But, to pass by irregularities and proceed with the observations of the Church, this were a proper place to take notice of several other usages, whereby they expressed their reverence to God at their first entrance into the church. But because some of these have been already considered in a former Book[91], where we speak of the respect and reverence which the primitive Christians paid to their churches, I shall but just name them in this place. Such was the ceremony of respect used by kings and emperors, who laid aside their crowns and arms and guards, when they entered into the house of the King of kings. Of which I have only this further to observe here, that probably it was done in imitation of the old Roman magistrates, who, as some authors[92] tell us, were wont to lay aside their *fasces* and other ensigns of honour, whenever they went into the schools of philosophy at Athens. Such was

[91] B. 8. ch. 10. v. 3. p. 187.

[92] Poli Synopsis Criticorum, in 2 Reg. 5, 9. (t. 1. p. 616. 19.) Principes Romani, dum essent cum imperio Athenis, fasces deposuerunt, quum scholas ingrederentur, ut philosophos audirent: quanto æquius submittunt se principes ad Verbum Dei honore afficiendum?

that other custom of respect observed by the monks of Egypt, who put off their shoes when they went into the house of God: but this, I showed, was only a topical custom peculiar to that nation, and not a general one reaching the whole Church. I observed also that there are some reasons to believe the Ancients used the ceremony of bowing towards the altar at their first entrance into the church, though the arguments amount only to a probability, not a demonstration.

That the bishop saluted the people with *Pax vobis*, at his entrance into the church.

13. It is more certain that the bishop saluted the people in the usual form, *Pax vobis! Peace be with you!* at his first entrance into the church. For this is often mentioned by St. Chrysostom[93], who derives it from apostolical practice.

And the people gave alms to the poor, who stood before the gates of the church for this purpose.

14. St. Chrysostom also mentions another very laudable custom, and he uses all his rhetoric to promote and encourage the practice of it: which was the people's giving alms to the poor at their first entrance into the church. 'For this reason,' says he[94], 'our forefathers appointed the poor to stand before the doors of our churches, that the sight of them might provoke the most backward and inhuman soul to compassion. And as by law and custom we have fountains before our oratories, that

[93] Hom. 36. in 1 Cor. p. 652. See before, ch. 6. s. 9. p. 469. n. 15.—Hom. 3. in Col. p. 1338. See ibid. s. 10. p. 475. n. 44.

[94] Hom. 25, de Verb. Apost. [Habent. eund. Spirit. Hom. 3.] t. 5. p. 369. (t. 3. p. 289 c.) *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τῶν οἴκων τῶν εὐκτηρίων ἔστησαν τοὺς πενητας οἱ πατέρες οἱ ἡμέτεροι, ἵνα καὶ τὸν νωθρότατον καὶ ἀπανθρωπότατον αὐτὴ τῶν πενήτων ἡ ὄψις πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν ἐγείρῃ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης. Ὅταν γὰρ ἑστήκῃ χορὸς γερόντων, συγκεκυφότων, ῥακία περιβεβλημένων, αὐχμώντων, ῥυπώντων, βακτηρίας ἐχόντων, μόλις στηρίζεσθαι δυναμένων, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκεκομμένων, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὅλον ἀναπήρων, τίς οὕτω λίθινος, τίς οὕτως ἀδάμας, ὡς καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας, καὶ τῆς ἀσθενείας, καὶ τῆς πηρώσεως, καὶ τῆς πενίας, καὶ τῆς εὐτελοῦς στολῆς, καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς πρὸς συμπάθειαν ἐπικλώντων αὐτὸν, ἀντιστῆναι, καὶ μεῖναι πρὸς ἅπαντα ταῦτα ἀνένδοτος; Διὰ ταῦτα πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἡμῶν ἑστήκασι παντὸς λόγου δυνατώτεροι, διὰ τῆς ὄψεως ἐπισπώμενοι, πρὸς φιλανθρωπίαν τοὺς εἰσιόντας ἐκκαλούμενοι. Καθάπερ γὰρ κρήνας εἶναι ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων νενόμισται, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες εὔχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, πρότερον ἀπονιψάμενοι τὰς χεῖρας, οὕτως αὐτὰς εἰς εὐχὴν ἀνατείνωσιν· οὕτω καὶ τοὺς πένητας ἀντὶ πηγῶν καὶ κρηνῶν ἔστησαν οἱ πατέρες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν· ἵν' ὥσπερ ὕδατι τὰς χεῖρας ἀπονίπτομεν, οὕτω φιλανθρωπίᾳ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀποσμήχοντες πρότερον οὕτως εὐχώμεθα· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτως ὕδατος φύσις ἀπονίπτει κηλίδας σώματος, ὡς ἐλεημοσύνης δύναμις ἀποσμήχει ῥύπον ψυχῆς. Ὥσπερ οὖν οὐ τολμᾷς ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν εἰσελθὼν εὔξασθαι, καί τοι ἔλαττον τὸ ἔγκλημα ἐκεῖνο, οὕτω μήτε χωρὶς ἐλεημοσύνης ἐπ' εὐχὴν ἔλθῃς πότε· καίτοι καὶ καθαρὰς πολλάκις ἔχοντες τὰς χεῖρας, ἂν μὴ πρότερον αὐτὰς ἀποπλύνωμεν ὕδατι, οὐκ ἀνατείνομεν εἰς εὐχήν· τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν ἡ συνήθεια· τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ποιῶμεν· κἂν μηδὲν ἑαυτοῖς ὦμεν συνειδότες μέγα ἁμάρτημα, ὅμως ἀποσμήχωμεν τὸ συνειδὸς διὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης.*

they who go in to worship God may first wash their hands, and so lift them up in prayer; so our ancestors, instead of fountains and cisterns, placed the poor before the doors of the church: that as we wash our hands in water, so we should cleanse our souls by beneficence and charity first, and then go and offer up our prayers. For water is not more adapted by nature to wash away the spots of the body, than the power of alms-deeds is to cleanse the filth of the soul. As therefore you dare not go in to pray with unwashen hands, though this be but a small offence; so neither should you without alms ever enter the church for prayer. You many times, when your hands are clean, will not lift them up to God, before you have washed them in water; so prevalent is the force of custom with us; let us therefore do the same with respect to alms-deeds: and though we are not conscious to ourselves of any great and heinous crimes, yet let us by charity clear our consciences of lesser spots and blemishes, which we contract in our daily business and conversation.' So again in another place[95], expounding those words, [Deut. 16, 16.] "Thou shalt not appear before the Lord empty:" 'These things,' says he, 'were spoken to the Jews, and how much more to us! Therefore the poor stand before the doors of the church, that no one should go in empty, but enter securely with charity for his companion. You go into the church to obtain mercy: first show mercy: make God your debtor, and then you may ask of him, and receive with usury. We are not heard barely for the lifting up our hands. Stretch forth your hands, not only to heaven, but to the hands of the poor: if you stretch out your hands to the poor, you touch the very height of heaven. For he that sits there receives your alms: but if you lift up barren hands, it

[95] Hom. 1. in 2 Tim. p. 131. (t. 11. p. 664 b.) Ἰουδαίοις ταῦτα ἐλέγετο, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἡμῖν; Διὰ τοῦτο ἑστήκασιν οἱ πένητες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, ἵνα μηδεὶς εἰσίῃ κενὸς, ἵνα μετὰ ἐλεημοσύνης εἰσίῃ. Εἰσέρχῃ ἐλεηθῆναι· ἐλέησον πρότερον· ὁ δὲ ὕστερον ἐρχόμενος πλέον ὀφείλει· ὅταν γὰρ ἀρξώμεθα ἡμεῖς, ὁ δεύτερος πλέον κατατίθησι. Ποίησόν σοι ὀφειλέτην τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ τότε αὐτὸν αἴτησαι· δάνεισον, καὶ τότε ἀπαίτει, ἵνα μετὰ τόκου λάβῃς. Βούλεται τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς, οὐκ ἀποφεύγει· ἂν μετὰ ἐλεημοσύνης αἰτῇς, χάριν ἔχει· ἂν μετὰ ἐλεημοσύνης ἀπαιτῇς, δανείζεις καὶ τόκους λαμβάνεις. Ναὶ, παρακαλῶ, οὐκ ἐν τῇ ἐκτάσει τῶν χειρῶν τὸ ἀκούεσθαί ἐστιν. Ἔκτεινόν σου τὰς χεῖρας μὴ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων χεῖρας· ἂν εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων χεῖρας ἐκτείνῃς τὴν χεῖρα, αὐτῆς ἥψω τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ὁ γὰρ ἐκεῖ καθήμενος λαμβάνει τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην· ἂν δὲ ἀκάρπους ἀνατείνῃς, οὐδὲν ὤνησας.

profits nothing.' He repeats the same in other places[95]; which shows that it was an excellent custom prevailing among them, and carefully recommended as a just preparation for prayer, among many other moral qualifications for this duty, which being vulgar and commonly known, I need not insist upon them in this place.

That they worshipped toward the east, with the reasons for this practice.

15. There was one observation more, which must not be omitted, because it was a ceremony almost of general use and practice: and this was the custom of their *turning their faces to the east* in their solemn adorations. The original of this custom seems to be derived from the ceremonies of baptism, in which, as has been shown before[96], it was usual to renounce the Devil with their faces to the west, and then turn about to the east, and make their covenant with Christ; from whence, I conceive, it became their common custom to worship God after the same way that they had first entered into covenant with him. The Ancients give several reasons for this custom, but they all seem to glance at this one.

1. Some say, *the east was the symbol of Christ*, who was called the Orient, and Light, and Sun of Righteousness in Scripture: and therefore, since they must worship toward some quarter of the world, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation. As Tertullian tells us in one place[97], 'that in fact they worshipped toward the east, which made the Heathen suspect that they worshipped the rising sun;' so in another place[98], he says, 'the east was the figure of Christ, and therefore both their churches and their prayers were directed that way.' Clemens Alexandrinus[99] says, 'they worshipped toward the east, because the east is

[95] Hom. 9. [Ed. Bened. 3. Ed. Savil. 6.] de Pœnitent. t. 1. p. 704. (t. 2. p. 296 e.) . . . . Ὥσπερ οἱ λουτῆρες ὕδατος πεπληρωμένοι εἰσὶ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἵνα νίψῃ τὰς χεῖρας· οὕτως οἱ πένητες καθέζονται, ἵνα πλύνῃς τὰς χεῖρας τῆς ψυχῆς. Ἔπλυνας τὰς χείρας τὰς αἰσθητὰς τῷ ὕδατι, πλῦνον τὰς χεῖρας τῆς ψυχῆς τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ.

[96] B. 11. ch. 7. s. 4. v. 4. p. 124.

[97] Apol. c. 16. (p. 16 b.) . . . Inde suspicio, quod innotuerit nos ad orientis regionem precari.

[98] Cont. Valentin. c. 3. (p. 251 b.) Nostræ columbæ etiam domus simplex, in editis semper et apertis et ad lucem; amat figura [al. figuram] Spiritus Sancti orientem, Christi figuram.

[99] Strom. 7. (p. 856. 25.) Ἐπεὶ δὲ γενεθλίου ἡμέρας εἰκὼν ἡ ἀνατολή, κακεῖθεν τὸ φῶς αὔξεται ἐκ σκότους λάμψαν τὸ πρῶτον· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ καλινδουμένοις ἀνέτειλε γνώσεως ἀληθείας ἡμέρα κατὰ λόγον τοῦ ἡλίου· πρὸς τὴν ἑωθινὴν ἀνατολὴν αἱ εὐχαί.

the image of our spiritual nativity, and from thence the light first arises and shines out of darkness, and the day of true knowledge, after the manner of the sun, arises upon those who lie buried in ignorance.' And St. Austin[1], 'When we stand at our prayers, we turn to the east, whence the heavens, or the light of heaven arises: not as if God was only there, and had forsaken all other parts of the world, but to put ourselves in mind of turning to a more excellent nature, that is, to the Lord.' This reason exactly falls in with that which is given for turning to the east, when they covenanted with Christ in the solemnities of baptism.

2. Another reason given for it by some is, that *the east was the place of Paradise*, our ancient habitation and country, which we lost in the first Adam by the fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Saviour. This reason is given by Gregory Nyssen[2] and St. Basil[3], and by the Author of the Constitutions[4], and the Author of the Questions and Answers to Antiochus among the works of Athanasius[5], together with Chrysostom, as he is cited by Cotelerius[6], and Gregentius[7],

[1] De Serm. Dom. in Monte, l. 2. c. 5. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 207 d.) . . . Cum ad orationes stamus ad orientem convertimur, unde cœlum surgit non tanquam ibi sit Deus, et quasi cæteras mundi partes deseruerit, qui ubique præsens est non locorum spatiis, sed majestate potentiæ; sed ut admoneatur animus ad naturam excellentiorem se convertere, id est, ad Deum, &c.

[2] Hom. 5. de Orat. Dom. (t. 1. p. 755 c.) Ἐπειδὰν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἑαυτοὺς τρέψωμεν· οὐχ ὡς μόνον ἐκεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ θεωρουμένου· ὁ γὰρ παντα-χοῦ ὢν κατ' οὐδὲν μέρος ἰδιαζόντως καταλαμβάνεται· ἐπίσης γὰρ περιέχει τὸ πᾶν· ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀνατολαῖς τῆς πρώτης ἡμῖν πατρίδος οὔσης· λέγω δὲ τῆς ἐν Παραδείσῳ διαγωγῆς, ἧς ἐκπεπτώκαμεν.

[3] De Spirit. Sanct. c. 27. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 77 a. n. 66.) Πάντες μὲν ὁρῶμεν κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν· ὀλίγοι δὲ ἴσμεν, ὅτι τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν πατρίδα, τὸν Παράδεισον, ὃν ἐφύτευσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Ἐδὲμ κατ' ἀνατολάς.

[4] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 264.) Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐξαναστάντες, καὶ ἐπ' ἀνατολὰς κατανοήσαντες, μετὰ τὴν τῶν κατηχουμένων καὶ τὴν τῶν μετανοούντων ἔξοδον, προσευξάσθωσαν τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κατὰ ἀνατολὰς, ὑπομιμνησκόμενοι καὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας νομῆς τοῦ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς Παραδείσου, ὅθεν ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἀθετήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν, ὄφεως συμβουλίᾳ πεισθεὶς, ἀπεβλήθη.

[5] Quæst. 37. (t. 2. p. 225 a.) Οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ ἀκουέτωσαν καὶ μανθανέτωσαν, ὅτι τούτου χάριν οἱ μακαριώτατοι Ἀπόστολοι κατὰ ἀνατολὰς τὰς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐκκλησίας προσέχειν ἐποίησαν, ἵνα πρὸς τὸν Παράδεισον ἀφορῶμεν, ὅθεν καὶ ἐξεπέσαμεν, πρὸς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἡμῶν πατρίδα καὶ χώραν, αἰτούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Δεσπότην ἀποκαταστῆσαι ἡμᾶς, ὅθεν ἐξωρίσθημεν.

[6] Not. in loc. Constit. Apost. supr. citat. ex Chrysost. in Dan. 6, 10. (ibid. n. 44.)

[7] Disput. cum Herbano Judæo (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 217 b. 4.) . . . Κατὰ ἀνατολὰς γὰρ ἐδιδάχ-

and many others. Now this is the very reason assigned by St. Cyril for turning to the east, when they covenanted with Christ, and celebrated the mysteries of baptism. So that hitherto we find a clear relation of these ceremonies one to the other, and a perfect agreement between them.

3. Another reason assigned for this custom was, that *the east was the most honourable part of the creation*, as being the seat of light and brightness. The author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox[8] gives this reason for it. 'We set apart,' says he, 'the most honourable things to the honour of God: and the east in the opinion of men, is the most honourable part of the creation: we therefore in time of prayer turn our faces to the east; as we sign those in the name of Christ, that need consignation, with the right hand, because it is deemed more honourable than the left, though it differ only in position, not in nature.' And Lactantius[9], without taking any particular notice of this custom, makes this general observation, 'That the east was more peculiarly ascribed to God, because he was the fountain of light, and illuminator of all things, and because he makes us rise to eternal life. But the west was ascribed to that wicked and depraved spirit the Devil, because he hides the light, and induces darkness always upon men, and makes them fall and perish in their sins.' Now this is a reason that equally holds for turning to the east in baptism, as well as in their daily devotion.

4. There is one reason more assigned for it, which is, *that Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and there ascended into heaven, and there will appear again at the last day*. This is one of the three answers, which the Author of

θημεν προσεύχεσθαι, διότι ἐκεῖ εὑρίσκομεν τὸν Θεὸν πλάσαντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸν Παράδεισον ποιήσαντα.

[8] Quæst. ad Orthodox. q. 118. (p. 471 d.) *Ἐπειδὴ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τὰ τιμιώτερα εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀφορίζομεν· κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπόληψιν τιμιωτέρα ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνατολὴ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν τῆς κτίσεως· διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς προσευχῆς νεύομεν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν πάντες. Καθάπερ τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ κατασφραγίζομεν τοὺς τῆς σφραγίδος ταύτης δεομένους, ἐπειδὴ τιμιωτέρα νενόμισται τῆς ἀριστερᾶς, καί τοι θέσει, καὶ οὐ φύσει, διαφέρουσα ταύτης ὑπάρχει· οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἀνατολὴ ὡς τιμιώτερον μέρος τῆς κτίσεως, εἰς προσκύνησιν Θεοῦ ἀφώρισται.*

[9] Instit. l. 2. c. 10. [al. c. 9.] (t. 1. p. 154.) Oriens Deo accensetur, quia ipse luminis fons, et illustrator est rerum, et quod oriri nos faciat ad vitam æternam. Occidens autem conturbatæ illi pravæque menti ascribitur, quod lumen abscondat, quod tenebras semper inducat, et quod homines faciat occidere ac interire peccatis.

the Questions to Antiochus, under the name of Athanasius[10], orders to be given to this question: 'If a Christian asks the question, he is to be told, They looked toward Paradise, beseeching God to restore them to their ancient country and region, from whence they were expelled. If an Heathen put the question, the answer should be, Because God is the true Light, for which reason, when they looked upon the created light, they did not worship it, but the Creator of it. If the question was proposed by a Jew, he should be told, They did it because the Holy Ghost had said by David, (Ps. 132, 7.) "We will worship toward the place where thy feet stood, O Lord!"' meaning the place where Christ was born, and lived, and was crucified and rose again, and ascended into heaven. Which seems also to be intimated by St. Hilary on those words of the 67th Psalm, according to the translation of the Septuagint[11], "Sing unto God, who ascended above the heaven of heavens in the east." 'The honour of God,' says he[12], 'who ascended above the heaven of heavens in the east, is now reasonably required: and for that reason toward the east, because he, according to the Prophet, is *the East*, or *Morning from on high;* that he, returning to the place whence he descended, might be known to be *the Orient Light*, who shall hereafter be the author of men's rising to the same ascent of a celestial habitation.'

These several reasons have all a peculiar reference to Christ: and therefore as Christians first used the ceremony of turning

[10] Quæst. ad Antioch. q. 37. (t. 2. p. 224 e.) Ἰουδαίοις μὲν οὖν εἴπομεν, ὅτι τούτου χάριν οἱ πιστοὶ προσκυνοῦμεν κατὰ ἀνατολὰς, τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος νομοθετήσαντος ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Δαβὶδ [τοῦ] εἰπόντος· Προσκυνήσωμεν εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ ἔστησαν οἱ πόδες Κυρίου. . . . Πρὸς δὲ Ἕλληνας ἐκεῖνο φαμὲν, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἐν ἀνατολαῖς περιγραφομένου τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς προσκυνοῦμεν· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἀληθινόν ἐστί τε καὶ ὀνομάζεται, τούτου χάριν πρὸς τὸ φῶς τὸ κτιστὸν ἀφορῶντες, οὐκ αὐτὸ, ἀλλὰ τὸν ποιητὴν αὐτοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν, ἐκ τοῦ λαμπροτέρου στοιχείου, τὸν πρὸ [leg. τῶν] πάντων στοιχείων καὶ τῶν αἰώνων ὑπέρλαμπρον Θεὸν γεραίροντες· οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ ἀκουέτωσαν, κ. τ. λ. See n. 5, preceding.

[11] [V. 33. juxt. Ed. Lambert. Bos. Franequer. 1709. (p. 763.) Ψάλατε τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς, κ.τ.λ. —Conf. ibid. v. 4. (p. 762.) Ἄσατε τῷ Θεῷ . . . τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[12] Ps. 67. [v. 34.] p. 242. (t. 1. p. 237 e. n. 34.) Competenter nunc ascendentis super cœlum cœli ad orientem Dei honor poscitur. . . . Ad orientem vero idcirco, quia ipse secundum Prophetam *Oriens ex alto* sit: ut regressus eo, unde descenderat, nosceretur, ipseque sit hominibus in hunc cœlestis sedis ascensum rursus auctor oriundi.

to the east, when they entered into covenant with Christ in baptism; so it is probable that from thence they derived this custom of turning to the east in all their solemn adorations. But whether this were so or not, we are sure there was such a general custom among them, and that it was founded upon some or all the reasons that have been mentioned; which is as much as is necessary to be said here for the illustration of it.

CHAP. IX.

Of the times of their religious assemblies, and the several parts of divine service performed in them.

No certain rule for meeting in public, except upon the Lord's-day, in times of persecution for the two first ages.

1. There remains one circumstance more of divine worship, which I have purposely reserved for this place, because the consideration of it will lead us to the several parts of the worship itself: that is, *the circumstance of time;* concerning which it may be inquired, how often they met in a week, and how often they met in a day, for divine worship?

Now, no general answer can be given to these questions, because the times of their assemblies varied according to the different state and ages of the Church. At first, learned men think they held assemblies every day in the Apostles' time, and whilst the Jewish temple stood. For we read of the Apostles going up to the temple "at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer;" (Acts 3, 1.) and of their "continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house," or *in their house,* meaning the church, or house of prayer, as others[11] render it: (Acts 2, 46.) though their most solemn meetings were on the first day of the week, or the Lord's-day. (Acts 20, 7. 1 Cor. 16, 2.) In after-ages, when the persecutions grew warm, they are thought to have confined themselves to the Lord's-day. For the confession, which Pliny[12] took from

[11] [Vid. Bez. in l. c. (Genev. 1582. p. 419.) Κατ' οἶκον, *domatim;* ut mox καθ' ἡμέραν, *quotidie,* et κατὰ πόλιν, *oppidatim,* Tit. 1, 5. Vulgata, *circa domos,* barbare et obscure.... Falsa est eorum interpretatio qui κατ' οἶκον interpretantur ἐν οἴκῳ, et οἴκου nomine ipsum templum intelligunt; &c. Ed.]

[12] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 278.) Affirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire: carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committe-

the mouths of some apostatizing Christians, mentions no other: they confessed to him, that the sum of their crime or error was, 'that they were used to meet on a certain stated day, before it was light, and sing an hymn to Christ, as to their God; and to bind themselves, by a covenant or sacrament, not unto any wickedness, but that they would not commit any theft, or robbery, or adultery, or break their faith, or deny what was committed to their trust; after which they were used to break up their assembly, and return again to a common feast.' Which is a plain description of their worship and communion and love feast, called *agape*, on the Lord's-day but no other. And so Justin Martyr[13], describing the Christian worship, says, 'that on the day called Sunday there was a general meeting of all that lived both in city and country, when they had the Scriptures read, and a sermon preached, and prayers, and the communion:' but he mentions no assembly for public worship on any other day: whence learned men[14] have concluded, that in his time the Church observed no other days of solemn assemblies, but only the Lord's-day. His silence as to all others is a negative argument against them, unless perhaps some distinction may be made between the general assembly of both city and country on the Lord's-day, and the particular assemblies of the city-Christians, who had better opportunities to meet on other days: which distinction we often meet with in

rent. . . .Quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, &c.

[13] Apol. 2. (p. 98 d.) Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἶτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν, καὶ, . . . παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. . . . Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε· καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτὴρ, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη.

[14] Vid. Cotelerium in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 59. (v. 1. p. 267. n. 52.) . . . . Celebrabantur conventus sacri, tempore Apostolorum, singulis diebus; (Act. 2, 46.) sed solemniores die Dominica. (Act. 20, 7, et 1 Cor. 16, 2.) Postea effecerunt persecutiones, cum summe sævirent hostes veritatis, ut rarius conveniretur, tantumque in Dominicis diebus: quod colligitur ex Apologetico Justini Martyris, et ex Plinii Epistola.

the following ages, when Christianity was come to its maturity and perfection.

2. However, it was not long after Justin Martyr's time, before we are sure the Church observed the custom of meeting solemnly for divine worship on Wednesdays and Fridays, which days are commonly called *the stationary days*, because they continued their assemblies on these days to a great length, till three o'clock in the afternoon: for which reason they had also the name of *semi-jejunia*, or *half-fasts*, in opposition to the Lent-fast, which was always held till evening, and *jejunia quartæ* and *sextæ feriæ, the fasts of the fourth and sixth days of the week*, that is, *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*. These are first mentioned by Tertullian, and Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen, and after them by most other writers, as fast days generally observed by the Church. But I consider them not here as fasts, which will be more properly done under another head, when we come to speak of the fasts and festivals of the Church, but here only look upon them as days of religious assembly, to discover what public divine worship was performed on them. And for this we are chiefly beholden to Tertullian, who assures us that on these days they always celebrated the communion; from whence we may infer that the same service was performed on these days as on the Lord's-day, unless perhaps the sermon was wanting. 'Some there were,' he says[15], 'who objected against receiving the communion on these days, because they were scrupulously afraid they should break their fast by eating and drinking the bread and wine in the eucharist: and therefore they chose rather to absent themselves from the oblation-prayers than break their fast, as they imagined, by receiving the eucharist.' Whom he undeceives by telling them, 'that to receive the eucharist on such days would be no infringement of their fast, but bind them closer to God: their station would be so much the more solemn for their standing at the altar of God; they might receive the body of the Lord, and preserve

The original of the stationary days, or church-assemblies on Wednesdays and Fridays, and what divine service was performed on those days.

[15] De Orat. c. 14. (p. 135 b.) Similiter et [de] stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini et reservato [al. re servata] utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii. [The author follows the reading *re servata*, which is surely the most correct as it is the most intelligible. Ed.]

their fast too; and so both would be safe, whilst they both participated of the sacrifice, and discharged their other obligation.'

Since therefore they received the eucharist on these days, we may conclude they had all the prayers of the communion-office, and what other offices were wont to go before them, as the psalmody, and reading of the Scriptures, and prayers for the catechumens and penitents, which, together with the sermons, were the whole service for the Lord's-day. But because even all this could not take up near so much time as must needs be spent in these stations, it seems most probable that in two particulars they much enlarged their service on these days, that is, in their psalmody, and private prayers and confession of their sins. The Psalms, as we shall see hereafter, were sometimes lengthened to an indefinite number, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more, as the occasion of a vigil or a fast required; and between every Psalm they had liberty to meditate and fall to their private prayers: and by these two exercises, so lengthened and repeated, it is easy to conceive how the longest station might be employed. Socrates[16] says, at Alexandria on these days they had sermons and all other service used at other times, except the communion. But admitting they had the whole service entire, as on the Lord's-day, yet it was not commensurate to the time of their stations, unless we suppose their psalmody and private devotions in the church to be enlarged on those days to a greater length than was usual in ordinary service. St. Basil[17] agrees with Tertullian in making these days not only fasts, but communion days: for, reckoning up how many days in the week they received the communion, he makes Wednesday and Friday to be two of the number. Yet still it is hard to conceive what business they could have to detain them so long in the church: since their collects and public prayers were but few in comparison; and therefore it seems most probable that a competent share of

[16] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 295. 31.) ...Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, τῇ Τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ Παρασκευῇ γραφαί τε ἀναγινώσκονται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ταύτας ἑρμηνεύουσι, πάντά τε τὰ συνάξεως γίνεται, δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς.

[17] Ep. 289. [al. 93.] ad Cæsar. Patric. t. 3. p. 278. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 267 d.) Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τέταρτον καθ' ἑκάστην ἑβδομάδα κοινωνοῦμεν· ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ, ἐν τῇ Τετράδι, καὶ ἐν τῇ Παρασκευῇ, καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡμέραις, ἐὰν ᾖ μνήμη μάρτυρός τινος [al. ἁγίου] τινός.

this time was spent in psalmody, and, as I find a learned person[18] inclined to think, in private devotions, which always had a share in their service, and was generally intermixed with their singing of psalms, as shall be shown in their proper places[19].

Saturday, or the seventh day, anciently observed with great solemnity, as a day of public devotion.

3. We always find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish Sabbath. It is not easy to tell either the original of this practice, or the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin Churches, excepting Milan, it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek Churches as a festival: I consider it here only as a day of public divine service, on which, as the authors who mention it assure us, all the same offices were performed as were used to be on the Lord's day. For Athanasius[20], who is one of the first that mentions it, says, 'they met on the Sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath.' And Timotheus[21], one of his successors in the see of Alexandria, says the communion was administered on this day, as on the Lord's-day; which were the only days in the week that the communion was received by the Christians of his time at Alexandria. Socrates[22] is a little more particular about the service: for he says, in their assemblies on this day they celebrated the communion, only the Churches of Egypt and Thebais differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbours at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place[23], speaking of the churches of Constantinople

[18] Stillingfleet, Orig. Britann. ch. 4. p. 224. (v. 3. p. 138.) That they had such private prayers, &c.

[19] See b. 14. ch. 1. and b. 15. ch. 1. s. 1. in the next vol.

[20] Hom. de Sement. t. 1. p. 1060. (t. 2. p. 45 d.) Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Σαββάτου συνήχθημεν οὐ νοσοῦντες Ἰουδαϊσμόν· οὐ γὰρ ἐφαπτόμεθα σαββάτων ψευδῶν· παραγεγόναμεν δὲ ἐν Σαββάτῳ τὸν Κύριον τοῦ Σαββάτου Ἰησοῦν προσκυνήσοντες.

[21] Ep. Canon. c. 13. (ap. Bevereg. Pand. t. 2. part 1. p. 168 e.).... Ἐξ ἀνάγκης τὸ Σάββατον καὶ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ, διὸ τὸ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν ἀναφέρεσθαι τῷ Κυρίῳ.

[22] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 295. 25.) Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ γείτονες ὄντες Ἀλεξανδρέων, καὶ οἱ τὴν Θηβαΐδα οἰκοῦντες, ἐν Σαββάτῳ μὲν ποιοῦνται συνάξεις· οὐχ, ὡς ἔθος δὲ Χριστιανοῖς, τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εὐωχηθῆναι, καὶ παντοίων ἐδεσμάτων ἐμφορηθῆναι, περὶ ἑσπέραν προσφέροντες, τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσιν.

[23] L. 6. c. 8. (ibid. p. 321. 38.) Ηνίκα οὖν ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος ἑορταὶ κατελάμβανον· φημὶ δὴ τό τε Σάββατον καὶ ἡ Κυριακή, ἐν αἷς αἱ συνάξεις κατὰ

in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday and the Lord's-day the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church-assemblies. And Cassian [24] takes notice of the Egyptian Churches, 'that among them the service of the Lord's-day and the Sabbath was always the same: for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament only, one out of the Gospels and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles; whereas on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament, and partly out of the New.' In another place [25] he observes, 'that in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord's-day, when they met at three o'clock, that is nine in the morning, to celebrate the communion.' In the Council of Laodicea there are three canons to the same purpose. One [26] appoints the Gospels with the other Scriptures to be read upon this day. Another [27], that the oblation of the bread in the eucharist shall not be made all the time of Lent, except on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day. Which implies that those were communion days, and kept as festivals even in Lent itself. And for the same reason a third canon [28] orders that no festivals of martyrs should be kept in Lent, but only commemorations of the martyrs be made on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day.

The only difference that was then made between the Sabbath and the Lord's-day was, that Christians were not obliged to rest from bodily labour on the Sabbath [29], but might work on

τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰώθασι γίνεσθαι· αὐτοὶ [οἱ Ἀρειανίζοντες] ἐντὸς τῶν τῆς πόλεως πυλῶν περὶ τὰς στοὰς ἀθροιζόμενοι, καὶ ᾠδὰς ἀντιφώνους πρὸς τὴν Ἀρειανὴν δόξαν συντιθέντες, ᾖδον.

[24] Instit. l. 2. c. 6. (p. 18.) In die vero Sabbati vel Dominico utrasque [lectiones] de Novo recitant Testamento, id est, unum de Apostolo vel Actibus Apostolorum, et aliam de Evangeliis.

[25] L. 3. c. 2. (p. 30.) Exceptis vespertinis [horis] ac nocturnis congregationibus, nulla apud eos per diem publica solemnitas, absque die Sabbati vel Dominica celebratur in quibus hora tertia sacræ communionis obtentu conveniunt.

[26] C. 16. (t. 1. p. 1500 b.) *Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Σαββάτῳ Εὐαγγέλια μετὰ τῶν ἑτέρων Γραφῶν ἀναγινώσκεσθαι.*

[27] C. 19. (ibid. 1505 a.) *Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῇ Τεσσαρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Σαββάτῳ καὶ Κυριακῇ μόνον.*

[28] C. 51. (ibid. b.) *Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν Τεσσαρακοστῇ μαρτύρων γενέθλιον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνείαν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς Σαββάτοις καὶ Κυριακαῖς.*

[29] Vid. C. Laodic. c. 29. (ibid. p. 1501 c.) *Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς Ἰουδαΐζειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ· τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν προτιμῶντες, σχολάζειν ὡς Χριστιανοί. Εἰ δὲ εὑρεθεῖεν Ἰουδαΐσταὶ, ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστῷ.*

that day, so far as divine service would permit, giving preference in this respect to the Lord's-day, whereon they were to rest as Christians. And if any transgressed these rules about working on the Sabbath, they were to be deemed Judaizers, and are ordered to be anathematized by another canon of the same Council. By which it appears[30], that Saturday was kept weekly as a day of public worship, but not as a Jewish Sabbath. Epiphanius mentions it likewise as a day of public assemblies in some places, but not in all. St. Basil[31] says it was one of the four days in the week, on which in his time they received the communion. By all which we may perceive, that the Author of the Constitutions had a plain regard to the practice of the Eastern Church, when he prescribed[32], 'that on every Sabbath save one, (that is the Saturday before Easter day,) and on every Lord's-day they should hold religious assemblies, and keep them as the weekly festivals:' that is, not only with psalmody, and reading the Scriptures, and common prayers, which was the ordinary service of the morning and evening of every day; but 'with sermons also, or preaching the Gospel, and the offering of the oblation, and reception of the holy food;' as he describes the service of the Sabbath and Lord's-day in another place[33].

How they observed the vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's-day, and other incidental festivals of martyrs.

4. Now as these were the two great festivals of every week, so they were commonly ushered in by the attendance of preceding pernoctations or vigils, which, as harbingers, went before to make preparations for the solemnities of the following days. These vigils were much of the same nature as the common nocturnal, or daily morning prayer, which was early before it was light: and they only differed from the usual

[30] Expos. Fid. n. 24. (t. 1. p. 1107 c.) *Ἐν τισι δὲ τόποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Σάββασι συνάξεις ἐπιτελοῦσιν κ. τ. λ.*

[31] Ep. 289. See before, s. 2. n. 17, preceding.—So Austin, Ep. 118. [al. 54.] ad Januar. (t. 2. p. 124 d.)...Alibi nullus dies omittitur [al. prætermittitur], quo non offeratur, alibi Sabbato tantium et Dominico.

[32] L. 5. c. 20. [al. 19.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 327.) *Πᾶν μέντοι Σάββατον ἄνευ τοῦ ἑνὸς, καὶ πᾶσαν Κυριακὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες συνόδους εὐφραίνεσθε.*—It. l. 8. c. 33. (p. 414.) *Σάββατον δὲ καὶ Κυριακὴν σχολαζέτωσαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν.*

[33] L. 2. c. 59. (Cotel. ibid. p. 268.) *Τί ἀπολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ ὁ μὴ συνερχόμενος ἐν τῇ δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούειν τοῦ σωτηρίου περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγου· ἐν ᾗ καὶ τρὶς εὐχὰς ἑστῶτες ἐπιτελοῦμεν, μνήμης χάριν τοῦ διὰ τριῶν ἀναστάντος ἡμερῶν· ἐν ᾗ Προφητῶν ἀνάγνωσις, καὶ Εὐαγγελίου κηρυκία, καὶ θυσίας ἀναφορὰ, καὶ τροφῆς ἱερᾶς δωρεά;*

antelucan service in this, that whereas the usual morning service never began till after midnight towards cock-crowing in the morning, these vigils were a longer service, that kept the congregation at church the greatest part of the night. These the Greeks called παννυχίδες, and the Latins, *pernoctationes et pervigilia, watchings all the night.*

St. Chrysostom often speaks of these: 'Go into the church,' says he[34], 'and there see the poor continuing from midnight to break of day: go, and see the holy pernoctations, joining day and night together: behold the people of Christ, fearing neither by night, nor by day, the tyranny of sleep or the necessities of poverty.' In another place[35] he calls them, πάννυχοι καὶ διηνεκεῖς στάσεις, *the continual and perfect night-stations,* in opposition to the stations by day, which were but partial and imperfect. 'By these,' he adds, 'you imitate the station of the angelical choir, whilst you offer up ἀκατάπαυστον ὑμνολογίαν, *psalmody and hymnody without ceasing,* to your Creator. O! the wonderful gifts of Christ! The armies of angels sing glory to God above: and on earth men, keeping their choral stations in the church, sing the same doxology after their example. The Cherubims above cry aloud, Holy! Holy! Holy! in the trisagion-hymn: and the congregation of men on earth below send up the same: and so a common general assembly is made of the inhabiters of heaven and earth together. Their thanksgiving is one and the same, their exultation the same, their joyful choral-station the very same.' In which words he plainly gives us to understand, that the angelical hymn, Glory be to God on high! and the cherubical hymn, or the *trisagion,* as it was called from the Cherubims thrice repeating the first words, Holy! Holy! Holy! were

[34] Hom. 4. de Verb. Esai. t. 3. p. 865. (t. 6. p. 121 b.) Εἴσελθε εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, . . . ἴδε πένητας ἐκ μεσονυκτίων μέχρι τῆς ἡμέρας παραμένοντας, βλέπε παννυχίδας ἱερὰς ἡμέρᾳ καὶ νυκτὶ συναφθείσας, οὔτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, οὔτε ἐν νυκτὶ τὴν τυραννίδα τοῦ ὕπνου, οὔτε τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς πενίας φοβουμένους.

[35] Hom. 1. de Verb. Esai. p. 834. (ibid. p. 95 d.) Ἐκ τῆς παννύχου ταύτης καὶ διηνεκοῦς στάσεως, ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἀγγελικὴν χοροστασίαν μιμουμένους, ἀκατάπαυστον τῷ Κτίστῃ τὴν ὑμνολογίαν προσφέρειν. Ὦ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ δωρημάτων· ἄνω στρατιαὶ δοξολογοῦσιν ἀγγέλων, κάτω ἐν ἐκκλησίαις χοροστατοῦντες ἄνθρωποι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις ἐκμιμοῦνται δοξολογίαν· ἄνω τὰ Σεραφὶμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἀναβοᾷ, κάτω τὸν αὐτὸν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμπει πληθύς. Κοινὴ τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ τῶν ἐπιγείων συγκροτεῖται πανήγυρις· μία εὐχαριστία, ἓν ἀγαλλίαμα, μία εὐφρόσυνος χοροστασία.

part of their sacred service in these night-stations: which, as I observed before, were but an earlier oblation of the ordinary morning service wherein we shall find the angelical hymn amongst other parts of divine worship always appointed to be used.

It were easy to make a long discourse here of the several sorts of these night-stations, or more complete vigils holding all the night through: for they were sometimes held upon extraordinary occasions of prayer, upon great emergencies and necessities of the Church; instances of which the curious reader may find several in Chrysostom [36], and St. Austin [37], and Ruffin [38], and Socrates [39], and Sozomen [40], and Theodoret [41]. Sometimes again they were kept as anniversary vigils to usher in the greater festivals of the Nativity, Epiphany, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost; of which sort there is mention made in Tertullian [42], Lactantius [43], Chrysostom [44], Socrates [45], and

[36] Hom. 20. [al. 21.] de Statuis. t. 1. p. 252. (t. 2. p. 214 e.) ..... Οὐκ ἔστι τῆς τυχούσης ψυχῆς ἐν τῇ τῶν πειρασμῶν ἐπαγωγῇ νήφειν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν βλέπειν.—Hom. 40. ad Juventin. t. 1. p. 550. (ibid. p. 581 c.) Συντρεχόντων πολλῶν, ψαλμῳδίας συνεχεῖς ἐτελοῦντο παννυχίδες ἱεραί. [Ed. Bened., ψαλμωδίαι συνεχεῖς ἐτελοῦντο, παννυχίδες ἱεραί. Ed.]

[37] Confess. l. 9. c. 7. (t. 1. p. 162 f.) Excubabat pia plebs in ecclesia, mori parata cum episcopo suo, servo tuo. Ibi mater mea, ancilla tua, solicitudinis et vigiliarum primas [partes] tenens, orationibus vivebat, &c. [Legendum? *vigebat.* Ed.]

[38] L. 1. [al. 10.] c. 12. (p. 229 a. 18.) Ad ultimum certam ei diem statuentes denuntiant, ut aut ipse Arium susciperet; aut, si reniteretur, se ecclesia pulso et in exilium truso, ab alio eum suscipiendum sciret. Tum ille nocte, quæ ad constitutam intererat diem, sub altari jacens, atque in oratione et lacrimis totam pervigilem ducens, ecclesiæ causam Domino commendabat.—L. 2. [al. 11.] c. 16. (p. 251 b. lin. ult.) Ambrosius vero adversum reginæ furorem, non se manu defensabat aut telo, sed jejuniis continuatisque vigiliis, sub altari positus, &c.

[39] L. 1. c. 37. (v. 2. p. 73. 47.) Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ᾗ ἐπώνυμον Εἰρήνη, μόνον ἑαυτὸν κατακλειστὸν ποιήσας, καὶ εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον εἰσελθὼν, ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ στόμα ἐκτείνας, εὔχεται δακρύων· νυκτας τε πολλὰς ἐφεξῆς καὶ ἡμέρας τοῦτο ποιῶν διετέλει, κ. τ. λ.—Conf. l. 2. c. 11. See n. 47, following.

[40] L. 2. c. 29. (ibid. p. 86. 37.) Τῇ δὲ πρὸ τῆς προθεσμίας ἡμέρᾳ, εἰσδὺς ὑπὸ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, παννύχιος ἔκειτο πρηνὴς, τοῦ Θεοῦ δεόμενος, κ. τ. λ.—Conf. l. 3. c. 6. (ibid. p. 100. 31.) Τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπιλαβούσης ἐκκλησίαζεν.

[41] L. 1. c. 14. (v. 3. p. 43. 12.) Ὁ τοίνυν ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλέξανδρος ἀκούσας ταῦτα, καὶ πάνυ λυπηθεὶς, εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἄρας πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ἀπωδύρατο· καὶ ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐν τῷ ἱερατείῳ, κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους, ηὔχετο.

[42] Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 4. (p. 168 d.) Quis denique solemnibus Paschæ abnoctantem securus sustinebit?

[43] Instit. l. 7. c. 19. (t. 1. p. 569.)

many others[46]. But the vigils we are here concerned to speak of, are only such as have some relation to the weekly service, of which number we may reckon those vigils of the Sabbath and Lord's-day the chief, because they returned constantly in the weekly revolution. Concerning which we have not only the forementioned authority of Chrysostom, but several others. For Socrates[47], giving an account of Athanasius's escape out of the church of Alexandria in the night, when the church was beset with soldiers to take him, says, it was evening, and the people were keeping their nocturnal vigils, because the next day was to be a *synaxis*, or *church-assembly*. Therefore Athanasius, fearing lest the people should suffer upon his account, bid the deacon give the signal or call to prayer, and he commanded a psalm to be sung, and whilst they were singing their psalmody, the soldiers were quiet, and they all meanwhile went out at one door of the church, and Athanasius in the midst of the singers escaped untouched and fled to Rome. Athanasius himself[48] has the same story in his Apology for his Flight, where he says, 'some of the people were keeping their

Hæc est nox, quæ a nobis, propter adventum Regis ac Dei nostri, pervigilio celebratur.

44 Hom. 30. in Gen. p. 424. (t. 4. p. 294 c.) Διὰ τοῦτο πολλοὶ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἐπιτείνουσι, καὶ ἀγρυπνίας καὶ παννυχίδας ἱερὰς, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνας ἐπιδείκνυνται, δεικνύντες δι' ὧν πράττουσι τὴν τιμὴν, ἣν περὶ τὴν ἑβδομάδα ἔχουσι.

45 L. 7. c. 5. (v. 2. p. 351. 3.) Μετ' οὐ πολὺ τὴν ἐκ προλήψεως ἑορτὴν ἐπετέλει· καὶ συνέρρεον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἔθους πολλοί· καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἔθους παννυχίδα ποιούντων, θόρυβός τις δαιμόνιος ἐνέπεσεν εἰς αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἄρα Σισίννιος ὁ αὐτῶν ἐπίσκοπος σὺν πολλῷ πλήθει ἔρχεται κατ' αὐτῶν.

46 Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 57. (v. 1. p. 659. 2.) Ἤδη ἡ μεγάλη τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρῆν· ἐν ᾗ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ Θεῷ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδοὺς συνδιενυκτέρευσε τοῖς ἄλλοις.—Hieron. in Matth. 25. (t. 7. p. 203 c.) Traditio Judæorum est, Christum media nocte venturum in similitudinem Ægyptii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est, et exterminator venit, et Dominus super tabernacula transiit, et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecrati sunt. Unde reor et traditionem apostolicam permansisse, ut in die vigiliarum Paschæ, ante noctis dimidium, populos dimittere non liceat, exspectantes adventum Christi.

47 L. 2. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 89. 22.) Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν· ὁ δὲ λαὸς ἐπαννύχιζε, προσδοκωμένης συνάξεως· ἤκει δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς, κατὰ φάλαγγα τοὺς στρατιώτας τάξας πανταχόθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ἀθανάσιος δὲ, ἑωρακὼς τὰ γινόμενα, φροντίδα ἔθετο, ὅπως ἂν τῷ λαῷ μηδαμῶς βλάβη γένηται δι' αὐτόν· καὶ, προστάξας διακόνῳ κηρύξαι εὐχὴν, αὖθις ψαλμὸν λέγεσθαι παρεσκεύασε. Συμφωνίας δὲ ἐκ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας γενομένης, διὰ μιᾶς τῶν πυλῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάντες ἐξῄεσαν. Τούτου γινομένου, οἱ στρατιῶται ἀπόμαχοι ἔμενον· ὁ δὲ Ἀθανάσιος ἐν μέσοις τοῖς ψαλμῳδοῦσιν ἀβλαβὴς διεσώζετο· τοῦτον δὲ τὸν τρόπον διεκφυγὼν, ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἀνέδραμε.

48 Apol. de Fug. t. 1. p. 716. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 264 f. n. 24.) Νὺξ μὲν γὰρ ἤδη ἦν, καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τινες ἐπαννύχιζον προσδοκωμένης συνάξεως.

night-vigil, expecting an assembly the next day.' And Socrates, in another place [49], speaking of these nocturnal vigils, kept both by the Arians and Catholics, says, 'they held them against the weekly festivals, the Sabbath, and the Lord's-day, on which days there were used to be general assemblies of the Church: and because the Arians were allowed no churches within the walls, they sung their hymns in the streets and porticos of the city till the morning light, and then went out to their meeting places without the gates.' And the historian observes, 'that Chrysostom, fearing the Arians might gain ground upon the Church by this practice, and draw away some of the more simple people, appointed some of his own people, who were used to nocturnal hymnody, to meet in the streets after the same manner; and to make the solemnity more splendid, the Empress gave them silver crosses to set their lamps in, appointing one of her own eunuchs, called Brison, to be their protector. Which so provoked the Arians, that they fell to blows upon it, and Brison and some others were slain in the engagement: which occasioned the Emperor wholly to put down those Arian meetings, and leave the Catholics quietly to go on with their vigils in the churches, as they had done before.'

From these accounts we may easily collect, both that there were such weekly vigils frequented by the more zealous and religious sort of people in all parts of the East, and also that psalms and hymns and prayers were the exercises wherewith they entertained themselves to the morning light. I might add many other testimonies out of Nazianzen [50], and other

[49] L. 6. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 321. 37.) Οἱ Ἀρειανίζοντες . . . ἔξω τῆς πόλεως τὰς συναγωγὰς ἐποιοῦντο· ἡνίκα οὖν ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος ἑορταὶ κατελάμβανον, φημὶ δὲ τό τε Σάββατον καὶ ἡ Κυριακὴ, ἐν αἷς αἱ συνάξεις κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰώθασι γίνεσθαι, αὐτοὶ ἐντὸς τῶν τῆς πόλεως πυλῶν περὶ τὰς στοὰς ἀθροιζόμενοι, καὶ ᾠδὰς ἀντιφώνους πρὸς τὴν Ἀρειανὴν δόξαν συντιθέντες ᾖδον· καὶ τοῦτο ἐποίουν κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τῆς νυκτός· ὑπὸ δὲ ὄρθρον, τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀντίφωνα λέγοντες, διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως ἐξήεσαν τῶν πυλῶν, καὶ τοὺς τόπους ἔνθα συνῆγον κατελάμβανον. . . . . Τότε δὴ καὶ Ἰωάννης, εὐλαβηθεὶς, μή τις τῶν ἁπλουστέρων ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων ᾠδῶν ἀφελκυσθῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀντιτίθησιν αὐτοῖς τοὺς τοῦ ἰδίου λαοῦ, ὅπως ἂν καὶ αὐτοὶ, ταῖς νυκτεριναῖς ὑμνολογίαις σχολάζοντες, ἀμαυρώσωσι μὲν τὴν ἐκείνων περὶ τούτου σπουδὴν, βεβαίους δὲ τοὺς οἰκείους πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν πίστιν ἐργάσωνται, κ. τ. λ.

[50] Carm. Iamb. 18. (t. 2. p. 218 d.)
Ὁρᾷς ἀγρύπνους πρὸς Θεὸν ψαλμῳδίας,
Ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν, φύσεως λελησμένων;
—Conf. Orat. 11. de Gorgonia. (t. 1. p. 183 c.) . . . . Ἑτέρων, πανννυχιζόντων ἐν ὀρθῷ σώματι, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. (p. 184 b.) Ὦ νυκτῶν ἀΰπνων, καὶ ψαλμῳδίας, καὶ στάσεως ἐξ ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολεγούσης.

Greek writers, but these are abundantly sufficient to show us the practice of the Oriental Church.

For the Latin Church we have the authority of St. Jerom[51], who, interpreting the word *watcher* in Daniel, says, 'it signifies the angels, who always watch, and are ready to obey the commands of God:' and he adds, 'We also by our frequent pernoctations or night-watches imitate the office of angels.' And it appears from him further, that women and virgins frequented this service, as well as men, for he advises Læta[52] to inure her daughter to these solemn pernoctations; only cautioning her to keep a guard upon her, and not let her wander from her side; for the same reason I presume, for which the Council of Eliberis[53] thought fit wholly to forbid women the observation of these vigils, because many, under pretence of prayer, were found to commit wickedness. There are many other passages in St. Austin, and St. Hilary, and other Latin writers, which speak of vigils; but because they may be understood either of private watchings in prayers at home, or of the common vigils of the ordinary morning prayer before day, I omit them in this place: only alleging that of St. Ambrose[54], where he seems to found this practice upon the imitation of Christ's example. 'The Lord Jesus,' says he, 'continued all night in prayer, not that he wanted the help of prayer, but to set thee an example to copy after: he continued all night praying for thee, that thou mightest learn after what manner to pray for thyself.'

But besides these stated vigils of the two weekly festivals, there was another sort of incidental ones, which came almost every week throughout the year, or at least were very frequent in some parts of it: those were the vigils of the festivals or anniversaries of the martyrs. Those anniversaries, as we

[51] In Dan. 4, 13. (t. 5. p. 647 d.) . . . . Significat autem angelos, quod semper vigilent, et ad Dei imperium sint parati. Unde et nos crebris pernoctationibus imitamur angelorum officia.

[52] Ep. 7. [al. 107.] ad Lætam. (t. 1. p. 680 b.) Vigiliarum dies et solennes pernoctationes sic virguncula nostra celebret, ut ne transverso quidem ungue a matre discedat.

[53] C. 35. (t. 1. p. 974 d.) Placuit prohiberi, ne fœminæ in cœmiterio pervigilent; eo quod sæpe sub obtentu orationis latentur scelera committant.

[54] Serm. 19. in Ps. 118, [al. 119,] 147. p. 740. (t. 1. p. 1213 f. n. 18.) Pernoctabat in oratione Dominus Jesus, non indigens precationis auxilio, sed statuens tibi imitationis exemplum. Ille pro te rogans pernoctabat, ut tu disceres quomodo pro te rogares.

shall see by and by, were always in great repute, and observed with the same solemnities of divine worship as the Sabbath, or the Lord's-day; and therefore their vigils were also celebrated with the same ceremony, as the vigils or night-stations of the two great weekly festivals. St. Chrysostom is an undoubted witness of this: for in an Homily made upon one of these festivals[55], he takes notice of the preceding vigil, that had continued all the night: 'Ye have turned,' says he, 'the night into day by keeping your holy stations all the night: do not now turn the day into night again by surfeiting and drunkenness and lascivious songs.' And Sidonius Apollinaris will testify the same, at least for some part of the Western Church: for writing about the festival of Justus[56], bishop of Lyons, he thus describes both the observation of the day, and the preceding vigil: 'We met,' says he, 'at the grave of St. Justus; it was a morning procession before day; it was an anniversary solemnity; the confluence of people of both sexes was so great, that the church, though very capacious and surrounded with cloisters, would not contain them. When the service of the vigil was ended, which the monks and clerical singers performed with alternate melody, we separated for some time, but went not very far away, as being to meet again at three o'clock,' that is, nine in the morning, 'when the priests were to perform divine service,' that is, the service of the communion, as on a festival.

Of the festivals of martyrs. Their original, and what divine service was performed on those days.

5. And now that we have mentioned the festivals of martyrs, as days of public religious worship, we must take notice of their original, to find out how early they became days of solemn addresses to God, and in what offices of divine service their observation consisted. These festivals were grown so numerous in the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret, that they

[55] Hom. 55. in Martyres. t. 5. p. 779. (t. 2. p. 668 d.) Ἐποιήσατε τὴν νυκτα ἡμέραν διὰ τῶν παννυχίδων τῶν ἱερῶν· μὴ ποιήσατε πάλιν τὴν ἡμέραν νύκτα διὰ τῆς μέθης, καὶ τῆς κραιπάλης, καὶ τῶν ἀσμάτων τῶν πορνικῶν.

[56] L. 5. Ep. 17. (p. 361.) Conveneramus ad Sancti Justi sepulchrum ... Processio fuerat antelucana, solemnitas anniversaria, populus ingens sexu ex utroque, quem capacissima basilica non caperet et quamlibet cincta diffusis cryptoporticibus. Cultu peracto vigiliarum, quas alternante mulcedine monachi clericique psalmicines concelebraverant, quisque in diversa secessimus, non procul tamen, utpote ad tertiam præsto futuri, cum sacerdotibus res divina facienda.

tell us[57], it was not once or twice or five times in a year that they celebrated their memorials, but they had oftentimes one or two in the same week, which occasioned frequent solemnities. The original of them is at least to be carried as high as the time of Polycarp, who suffered about the year 168. For the Church of Smyrna, whereof he was bishop, in their Epistle to the Church of Philomelium, recorded by Eusebius[58], tell them, 'that they intended, if God would permit, to meet at his tomb and celebrate his birth-day, (that is, the day of his martyrdom,) with joy and gladness, as well for the memory of the sufferer, as for example to posterity.' Tertullian[59] speaks of these anniversary festivals, as observed in his time: 'We offer,' says he, 'oblations for those that are dead, for their nativities on their anniversary-day.' And Cyprian[60] orders his clergy to note down the days of their decease, that a commemoration of them might be celebrated amongst the memories of the martyrs. And in another place[61] he says, 'they offered sacrifices for them, as often as they celebrated their passions, or days of martyrdom, by an anniversary commemoration.' These sacrifices were the sacrifices of prayer, and thanksgiving to God for the examples of the martyrs, and the celebration of the eucharist on these days, and the offerings of alms and oblations for

[57] Chrysost. Hom. 40. in Juventin. t. 1. p. 546. (t. 2. p. 578 a.) *Ὁ μακάριος Βαβύλας πρώην ἡμᾶς ἐνταῦθα μετὰ παίδων τριῶν συνήγαγε· σήμερον στρατιωτῶν ξυνωρὶς ἁγίων, τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατόπεδον ἐπὶ τῆς παρατάξεως ἔστησε· τότε ἅρμα μαρτύρων, νῦν ξυνωρὶς μαρτύρων.*—Theodoret. Serm. 8. de Martyr. t. 4. p. 605. [al. Græcor. Affect. Curat. disput. 8.] (t. 4. part. 2. p. 921.) *Εἰς δὲ τούτους [σηκοὺς μαρτύρων] οὐχ ἅπαξ ἢ δίς γε τοῦ ἔτους ἢ πεντάκις φοιτῶμεν· ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μὲν πανηγύρεις ἐπιτελοῦμεν.*—[Conf. Chrysost. de SS. Martyr. Serm. (t. 2. p. 650 a.) *Χθὲς μαρτύρων ἡμέρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ σήμερον μαρτύρων ἡμέρα. Εἴθε καὶ ἀεὶ μαρτύρων ἡμέραν ἐπετελοῦμεν.*—Hom. in Omnes. SS. Martyres. (ibid. p. 711 a.) *Ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἱερὰν πανήγυριν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἐπετελέσαμεν, οὔπω παρῆλθεν ἡμερῶν ἑπτὰ ἀριθμὸς, καὶ πάλιν κατέλαβεν ἡμᾶς μαρτύρων χορὸς, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[58] L. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 171. 18.) *Ἔνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ, παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἴς τε τῶν προηθληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν.*

[59] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus.

[60] Ep. 12. [al. 37.] (p. 188.) Denique et dies eorum, quibus excedunt, annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus.

[61] Ep. 59. [al. 34.] p. 77. (p. 224.) Sacrificia pro iis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.

the poor; which, together with a panegyrical oration or sermon, and reading the Acts or Passion of the martyr, if they had any such recorded, were the exercises and special acts of devotion in which they spent these days. For these were always esteemed high festivals, and therefore the same service that was performed on the Sabbath and Lord's-day was always performed on them. They never passed without a full assembly, nor without a sermon or a communion, as appears from some of Chrysostom's Homilies upon such occasions. To dissuade the people from intemperance, he bids[62] them consider 'how absurd it was after such a meeting, after a whole night's vigil, after hearing the holy Scriptures, after participating of the divine mysteries, after such a spiritual repast, for a man or a woman to be found spending whole days in a tavern.' The foundation of his argument is built upon this supposition, that they had received the eucharist in the church before, in celebrating the memorial of a martyr. And so Sidonius Apollinaris represents the matter in the passage just now cited from him[63], that after they had kept the vigil of St. Justus the night preceding, they assembled again by day at nine in the morning, when the priests did *rem divinam facere, offer the oblation*, or consecrate the eucharist, as Savaro[64] rightly interprets it.

But besides the usual solemnities of other festivals, there was one thing peculiar to these festivals of the martyrs: which was, that the History of their Passions, as they were taken by the notaries, appointed by the Church for this purpose, were commonly read in the assembly upon such occasions. It was at least the common practice of the African Churches; for St. Austin[65] speaks of it as an usual thing, indulging his people

[62] Hom. 59. de SS. Martyr. t. 5. p. 779. (t. 2. p. 669 a.) *Ἐννόησον, ἡλίκος γέλως, μετὰ τοιαύτην σύνοδον, μετὰ παννυχίδας, μετὰ Γραφῶν ἁγίων ἀκρόασιν, μετὰ μυστηρίων θείων κοινωνίαν, καὶ μετὰ πνευματικὴν χορηγίαν, ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἐν καπηλείῳ φαίνεσθαι διημερεύοντας.*

[63] L. 5. Ep. 17. See n. 56, preceding.

[64] In Sidon. loc. supr. cit. (p. 364.) *Res divina facienda*, id est, missarum solemnia celebranda, missa facienda, sacrificia offerenda, ut ipse loquitur, Ep. 15. l. 4. [Ibid. (p. 274.) Ad quæ festa vos voti, nos ministerii, officii multos, fidei totos causa solicitat. Ed.]

[65] Hom. 26. ex. 50. t. 10. p. 174. [al. Serm. 300. append.] (t. 5. append. p. 504 b.)... Quando aut Passiones prolixæ, aut certe aliquæ lectiones longiores, qui stare non possunt, humiliter et cum silentio sedentes attentis auribus audiant, quæ leguntur.

with liberty to sit, whilst they heard them read, because they were sometimes of a considerable length; and the third Council of Carthage[65] made a canon to encourage the reading of them. Mabillon[66] gives several other instances out of Alcimus Avitus, Cæsarius Arelatensis, and Ferreolus, to show that they were read also in the French Churches. Only they were forbidden in the Roman Church by the decree of Pope Gelasius[67] in his synod of seventy bishops, under pretence that they were written by anonymous authors, and sometimes by ignorant Heathens, and sometimes by heretical authors, as the Passions of Cyricus, Julitta, and St. George: for which reason they had by ancient custom prohibited the reading of them in the Roman Church. But this rule it seems did not then prescribe to other Churches.

Solemn assemblies for preaching and other acts of divine worship held every day during the whole forty days of Lent, and the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide.

6. It may be further observed, that during the whole forty days of Lent, they had continual assemblies not only for prayers, but preaching also: as is evident from Chrysostom's sermons, many of which were preached by him successively one day after another throughout the greatest part of that season; as his Homilies upon Genesis, and those famous Discourses called his Ἀνδριάντες, preached at Antioch in Lent upon the occasion of a tumult, wherein the Emperor's statues were demolished. And many other instances may be given of the same practice, of which more hereafter under the head of preaching[68] in the next Book. It is true indeed they did not always consecrate the eucharist in Lent, but only upon the Sabbath and Lord's-day, as we learn from the Council of Laodicea[69], which expressly forbids the oblation of the bread in Lent upon any other day besides the Sabbath and the Lord's-day. The reason of which was, that these two days were observed as festivals even in Lent itself; and they did not ordi-

[65] C. 47. (t. 2. p. 1177 b.) Liceat etiam legi Passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur.

[66] De Cursu Gallicano, (pp. 403, seqq.)

[67] Decret. ap. Crabb. t. 1. p. 992. (ap. Labb. C. Rom. 1. t. 4. p. 1263 b.) Singulari cautela, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, in sancta Romana ecclesia non leguntur, quia et eorum, qui conscripsere, nomina penitus ignorantur; et ab infidelibus idiotis superflua, aut minus apta, quam rei ordo fuerit, scripta esse putantur; sicut cujusdam Cyrici [al. Quirici] et Julitæ, sicut Georgii aliorumque hujusmodi Passiones, quæ ab hæreticis perhibentur compositæ.

[68] B. 14. ch. 4.

[69] C. 49. (t. 1. p. 1505 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῇ Τεσσαρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Σαββάτῳ καὶ Κυριακῇ μόνον.

narily consecrate the eucharist upon the solemn fasts in the time of this Council: but instead of the consecration-service they had probably that, which in the following ages is called προηγιασμένων λειτουργία, *missa præsanctificatorum, the office of the presanctified elements*, which was a shorter service for communicating on fast-days in the elements, that were consecrated before on the Lord's-day festival, about which there is a particular direction in the Council of Trullo[70]. So that, one way or other, they seem to have had both a communion and a sermon every day in Lent.

Then again the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide were a sort of perpetual festival, and observed with great solemnity, as days of joy, from the time of Tertullian, who mentions it[71], and triumphs over the Heathen upon it, 'that besides the Sunday, which returned once in eight days, this one continued festival of Pentecost was more than all the festivals the Heathen could pretend to reckon up in a whole year.' He does not tell us here indeed with what solemnity they observed this time, but in another place[72] he assures us, they had solemn worship every day, and paid the same respect to it as they did to the Lord's-day, in that they neither fasted nor prayed kneeling on any day during this whole interval, which was the commemoration of our Saviour's resurrection and ascension. Whence it is no improbable conjecture, that during this season they might have the same complete worship every day, that they had upon the Lord's-day.

Public prayer morning and evening every day in the third century.

7. And this consideration will lead us to fix the date of the setting up morning and evening prayer daily in the Church. For if the persecutions would give leave in Tertullian's time to keep fifty days together as solemn festivals; there is no reason to imagine that they could not as well meet every day for their ordinary devotions. And if Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as stationary days, with more than ordinary

[70] C. 52. (t. 6. p. 1166 e.) Ἐν πάσαις τῆς ἁγίας Τεσσαρακοστῆς τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέραις, παρεκτὸς Σαββάτου, καὶ Κυριακῆς, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ εὐαγγελισμοῦ ἡμέρας, γινέσθω ἡ τῶν προηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία.

[71] De Idololat. c. 14. (p. 94 b.) Ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est: tibi octavus quisque dies [al. octavo quoque die]. Excerpe singulas solemnitates nationum, et in ordinem exsere [al. texe], Pentecosten implere non poterant.

[72] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

attendance, as we have heard him declare before[72]; there is little reason to question, but that every day might have an ordinary vigil or morning assembly. It was not long after Tertullian's time that Cyprian[73] assures us, they received the eucharist every day; and he thinks that petition in the Lord's Prayer may bear this sense, when we say, Give us this day our daily bread; which was also Tertullian's[74] sense of it before him. Now this is demonstration then, that they had assemblies for public worship every day, since they received the eucharist every day, which they did not use to consecrate but in public assemblies of the Church. From this time therefore there is no dispute about the Church's daily sacrifice of prayer in her morning assemblies: which in after-ages are commonly called *cœtus antelucani*, and *vigiliæ*, and *horæ nocturnæ*, because they were a sort of *ordinary vigils*, or *night-assemblies*, held *before it was light*, though not so early as those other sort of vigils, or night-stations, before the Sabbath and Lord's-day, which were of longer duration, as has been noted already of them in its proper place, [in the fourth section preceding.]

As to evening prayer, public in the church, Mr. Mede[75] thinks there is no mention made of it in Cyprian or Tertullian, nor in any writers before the Author of the Constitutions and the Council of Laodicea: he thinks *the ninth hour of prayer*, mentioned by Cyprian[76], relates only to private prayer, which is very probable; and that Tertullian's *nocturnæ convocationes* mean not evening but morning prayers early before day, which is undoubtedly true. But then he seems not to have

[72] See s. 2. n. 15, preceding.

[73] De Orat. Dom. p. 147. (p. 104.) Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, ... a Christi corpore separemur.

[74] De Orat. c. 6. (p. 131 d.) ... Corpus ejus in pane censetur: hoc est corpus meum. Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo, et individuitatem a corpore ejus.

[75] Ep. 66. (p. 840.) For even-song publick in the Church, there is very little to be produced &c.

[76] De Orat. Dom. p. 154. (p. 108.) In orationibus vero celebrandis invenimus observasse cum Daniele tres pueros in fide fortes, et in captivitate victores, horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, sacramento scilicet Trinitatis, quæ in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat. ... Quando a septima nona completur, per ternas horas Trinitas perfecta numeratur: quæ horarum spatia jam pridem spiritaliter determinantes adoratores Dei, statutis et legitimis ad precem temporibus serviebant; et manifesta postmodum res est sacramenta olim fuisse; quod ante sic justi precabantur, &c.

considered, that in Cyprian's time there was a custom among some of communicating after supper: for he plainly mentions it[77], though he did not like the custom: and this custom continued among the Egyptians till the time of Socrates[78], who speaks of it then as something peculiar to those Churches. Now if there was a custom in Cyprian's time of communicating after supper, there is no doubt to be made of evening prayer at the same time. Rigaltius[79], and after him Bishop Fell[80] and Dr. Cave[81], carry this custom of communicating after supper as high as Tertullian: but I think they mistake his words; for he does not say[82] that they communicated after supper, but 'that Christ at supper-time gave the command for the sacrament of the eucharist to all, though then they communicated in their morning assemblies, and received it from the hands of none but their governors.' I lay no stress therefore upon this proof, but think the proof of evening prayer may be rationally deduced from that of Cyprian; after whom the Author of the Constitutions not only speaks of it[83], but gives us the order both of their morning and evening service, with which I shall present the reader in the following chapters. The Council of Laodicea[84] speaks of the evening service together with that

[77] Ep. 63. ad Cæcilium. p. 156. (p. 277.) An illa sibi aliquis contemplatione blanditur, quod et si mane aqua sola offerri videtur, tamen cum ad cœnandum venimus, mixtum calicem offerimus?

[78] L. 5. c. 22. See before, s. 3. n. 22, preceding.

[79] In Cypr. loc. supr. citat. (p. 277. [corrige, 281.] n. 5.) Ævo jam Tertulliani mutatum aliquid circa hoc sacramentum fuisse colligitur, et non solum vespere, in tempore victus, sed etiam horis antelucanis, sacramentum corporis Christi celebratum fuisse arguunt hæc verba, Libr. de Corona: *Eucharistiæ sacramentum in tempore victus mandatum a Dominum etiam antelucanis horis sumimus.*

[80] In dict. Cypr. loc. (p. 281. n. 3.) Constat eucharistiam, licet horis antelucanis sumptam, vespere etiam distribui solitam; cujus rei locuples testis Tertullianus, libr. de Corona, c. 3.: *Eucharistiæ sacramentum tempore victus de præsidentium manu sumimus.* Et alibi monet, ut finitis stationibus sumatur.

[81] Primitive Christianity, part. 1. ch. 11. p. 338. (p. 164.) Tertullian assures us &c.

[82] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Eucharistiæ sacramentum et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus.

[83] L. 8. c. 35. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 416.) Ἑσπέρας γενομένης, συναθροίσεις τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ἐπιλύχνιον ψαλμὸν, προσφωνήσει ὁ διάκονος ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων, καὶ χειμαζομένων, καὶ τῶν φωτιζομένων, καὶ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, κ. τ. λ.

[84] C. 18. (t. 1. p. 1500 b.) Περὶ τοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν εὐχῶν πάντοτε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑννάταις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις ὀφείλειν γίνεσθαι.

of the nones, or three in the afternoon, and orders the same service to be used in both. The Greeks commonly called it λυχναψία, and the Latins *lucernarium*, because it commonly began at the time when the day went off, and when *they lighted candles* for the night. It is likewise frequently styled *sacrificium vespertinum*, *the evening sacrifice*, and *missa vespertina*, as those names are used to signify in general the service or prayers of the Church.

And these two, evening and morning, are the most celebrated times of the ancient daily service, which are to be found almost in every ecclesiastical writer; so that it is altogether needless here to insist any further upon them.

The original of the canonical hours of prayer. No notice of them for public prayer, but only for private, in the three first ages.

8. There remains one question more concerning those times of prayer which are commonly called *the canonical hours*, that is, besides the forementioned evening and morning prayer, those that are called the first, the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours, with the *completorium*, or *bed-time*. They who have made the most exact inquiries into the original of these as fixed hours of public prayer, can find no footsteps of them in the three first ages, but conclude they came first into the Church with the monastic life. So Mr. Mede[85], and Bishop Pearson[86], who observes that Tertullian mentions the third, sixth, and ninth hours of prayer: but then he is disputing as a Montanist[87] against the Catholics, and urging the necessity

[85] Ep. 66. See s. 7. n. 75, preceding.

[86] Pearson, Lect. 2. in Act. nn. 3, 4. (v. 1. p. 330, 331.) Hinc arcessunt &c.

[87] De Jejun. c. 10. (p. 549 b.) Æque stationes nostras, ut indignas, quasdam vero et in serum constitutas, novitatis nomine incusant; hoc quoque munus et ex arbitrio obeundum esse dicentes, et non ultra nonam detinendum, de suo scilicet more. Sed quod pertineat ad interdictionis quæstionem, semel pro omnibus causis respondebo. Nunc ad proprium hujus speciei articulum, de modo temporis dico, de ipsis prius expostulandum, unde hanc formam nona dirimendis stationibus præscribant. Si, quia Petrus, et qui cum eo, ad horam nonam orationis templum introgressi leguntur, quis mihi probabit illos ea die statione functos, ut horam nonam ad clausulam et expunctionem stationis interpretetur? Atqui facilius invenias Petrum hora sexta capiendi cibi causa, prius in superiora ad orandum ascendisse, quo magis sexta diei finiri officio huic possit, quæ illud absolutura post orationem videbatur. Porro, cum in eodem Commentario Lucæ et tertia hora orationis demonstretur, sub qua Spiritu Sancto initiati pro ebriis habebantur; et sexta, qua Petrus ascendit in superiora; et nona, qua templum sunt introgressi; cur non intelligamus, salva plane indifferentia semper et ubique et omni tempore orandi, tamen tres istas horas, ut insigniores in rebus humanis, quæ diem distribuunt, quæ negotia distinguunt, quæ publicæ resonant;

of observing the rules of the Montanists in all the heights of their austerities and pretences of mortification and devotion above the Church. And he does not intimate that either the Montanists or the Catholics observed these hours for public assemblies. Cyprian[88] indeed recommends these hours of prayer, from the example of Daniel, and other arguments, to Christians in their private devotions: but he does not so much as once suggest that the Church had then by any rule made these the stated hours of public devotion.

That which evidently confirms this opinion is an observation to be made out of Cassian, who particularly describes the devotions of these canonical hours, and the gradual rise of them. For they had not all their original at the same time. The first monks of Egypt, who were the founders of the monastic life, he assures us[89], never observed any other canonical hours for public devotion, but only evening and morning early before day: all the rest of their time they spent at work privately, joining private meditation of the Scriptures, singing of Psalms, and prayers, continually with their labour. Not long after the monasteries of Mesopotamia and Palestine set up the practice[90] of meeting publicly at the third, sixth, and ninth hours for performing their psalmody and devotions. But as yet there was no new morning service distinct from that of the old

ita et solemniores fuisse in orationibus divinis? Quod etiam suadet Danielis quoque argumentum, ter die orantis, utique per aliquarum horarum exceptionem; non aliarum autem quam insigniorum, exinde apostolicarum, tertiæ, sextæ, nonæ, &c.

[88] De Orat. Dom. p. 154. See s. 7. n. 76, preceding.

[89] Instit. l. 3. c. 2. (p. 30.) Apud illos etenim hæc officia, quæ Domino solvere per distinctiones horarum, et temporis intervalla cum admonitione compulsoris adigimur, per totum diei spatium jugiter cum operis adjectione spontanea celebrantur. Ita namque ab eis incessanter operatio manuum privatim per cellulas exercetur, ut Psalmorum quoque, vel cæterarum Scripturarum meditatio nunquam penitus omittatur. Cui preces et orationes per singula momenta miscentes, in his officiis, quæ nos statuto tempore celebramus, totum diei tempus absumunt. Quamobrem, exceptis vespertinis [horis] ac nocturnis congregationibus, nulla apud eos per diem publica solemnitas, absque die Sabbati vel Dominica, celebratur.

[90] Ibid. c. 3. (p. 32.) Itaque, in Palæstinæ vel Mesopotamiæ monasteriis ac totius Orientis, supradictarum horarum solemnitates trinis Psalmis quotidie finiuntur; ut et orationum assiduitas statutis temporibus Deo offeratur, et necessaria operationis officia, consummatis justo moderamine spiritalibus obsequiis, nullatenus valeant impediri. His enim tribus temporibus etiam Danielem Prophetam quotidie fenestris apertis in cœnaculo preces Domino fudisse cognoscimus. Nec immerito hæc specialius tempora religiosis sunt officiis deputata, &c.

morning service before day. This was first begun in the monastery of Bethlehem[91], and thence propagated into others, but not received in all. And the *completorium*, or *bed-time service*, was utterly unknown to the Ancients, as distinct from the *lucernaris*, or *evening service*, as Bona[92] himself proves against Bellarmin. So that these canonical hours came gradually into the Church, and are all of them owing to the rules of the Eastern monasteries for their original. Therefore what a learned man[93] among ourselves says must be taken with a little qualification, else it will not be true: 'that the Universal Church anciently observed certain set hours of prayer, that all Christians throughout the world might at the same time join together to glorify God: and some of them[94] were of opinion that the angelical host, being acquainted with those hours, took that time to join their prayers and praises with those of the Church.' If this be understood of any rule or the custom of the Universal Church for hours of public prayer, besides those of morning and evening, in the three first ages, it will not be true: but if it only mean that there were directions given for the encouragement of private prayer at those set times, and that Christians generally observed them in private, it may be allowed; since not only Origen, but Cyprian,

[91] Ibid. c. 4. (p. 36.) Sciendum tamen hanc matutinam [solemnitatem] quæ nunc observatur in Occiduis vel maxime regionibus, canonicam functionem nostro tempore in nostro quoque monasterio primitus institutam, ubi Dominus noster Jesus Christus natus ex virgine, humanæ infantiæ suscipere incrementa dignatus, nostram quoque adhuc in religione teneram et lactentem infantiam sua gratia confirmavit. Usque ad illud enim tempus hac solemnitate matutina, quæ expletis nocturnis psalmis et orationibus post modicum temporis intervallum solet in Galliæ monasteriis celebrari, cum quotidianis vigiliis pariter consummata, reliquas horas refectioni corporum deputatas a majoribus nostris invenimus.'

[92] De Psalmod. c. 11. s. 1. n. 3. (p. 412.) Nulla enim completorii mentio &c.

[93] Patrick of Prayer, part 2. ch. 11. (p. 109.) Such petitions &c.—after citing a passage from Chrysostom, on which and on some other places he comments.

[94] Vid. Origen. Περὶ Εὐχῆς, nn. 33, 35 tot. [juxt. Ed. Oxon. 8vo. Conf. n. 11. juxt. Ed. Bened. (t. 1. p. 213 c.) Οὐ μόνος δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τοῖς γνησίως εὐχομένοις συνεύχεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ χαίροντες ἄγγελοι ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι, κ.τ.λ.—Ibid. sub fin. (p. 215 c.) ... Οὕτως ὑποληπτέον συνάγεσθαί ποτε τῶν ἐπισκοπούντων καὶ λειτουργούντων τῷ Θεῷ ἀγγέλων παρουσίαν τῷδέ τινι τῶν εὐχομένων κ.τ.λ.—Ibid. n. 31. (p. 268 f.) Ἔχει δέ τι ἐπίχαρι εἰς ὠφελείαν τόπος εὐχῆς, τὸ χωρίον τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν πιστευόντων συνελεύσεως, ὡς εἰκὸς, καὶ ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων ἐφισταμένων τοῖς ἀθροίσμασι τῶν πιστευόντων, κ.τ.λ. Ed.]

as we have heard before, writes in favour of them, and Clemens Alexandrinus[95] says some allotted set hours for prayer, the third, sixth, and ninth. So necessary is it to distinguish between public and private devotions, and between the first and the following ages, when we speak of canonical hours of prayer as appointed by the Church Universal. For even after they were set up in the monasteries, they were not immediately observed in all the Churches.

For Epiphanius[96], speaking of the customs of the Catholic Church, mentions the morning hymns and prayers, and the evening psalms and prayers, but no other. So Chrysostom often mentions[97] the daily service in the church morning and evening: and at the most never speaks[98] of above three times a day for public assemblies. For thus he brings in a secular man complaining, and saying, 'How is it possible for me, who am a secular man, and pinned down to the courts of law, to run to church, and pray at the three hours of the day?' In answer to which Chrysostom does not say that the Church had these three hours of prayer for laymen, and more for others; but he tells the man of business, 'that if he could not come to church because he was so fettered to the court, yet he might pray even as he stood there; since it was the mind and the voice, and the elevation of the soul, rather than the lifting up of the hands, that was to be regarded in prayer.

[95] Stromat. 7. (p. 854. 18.) *Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ ὥρας τακτὰς ἀπονέμουσιν εὐχῇ, ὡς τρίτην, φέρε, καὶ ἕκτην, καὶ ἐννάτην, ἀλλ' οὖν γε ὁ γνωστικὸς παρὰ ὅλον εὔχεται τὸν βίον, δι' εὐχῆς συνεῖναι μὲν σπεύδων Θεῷ.*

[96] Expos. Fid. n. 23. (t. 1. p. 1106 a.) *Ἑωθινοί τε ὕμνοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ διηνεκεῖς γίνονται, καὶ προσευχαὶ ἑωθιναὶ, λυχνικοί τε ἅμα ψαλμοὶ καὶ προσευχαί.*

[97] Hom. 18. in Act. pp. 174, 176. (t. 9. p. 150 d.) *Οἷόν ἐστιν ἀπελθεῖν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδέναι ὅτι αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ᾠκοδόμησε, καὶ ῥίψαι ἑαυτὸν ὕπτιον, καὶ, μετὰ τὴν αἰώραν τὴν σωματικὴν, καὶ λυχνικοῖς καὶ ἑωθινοῖς ὕμνοις παραγενέσθαι, ὁμοτράπεζον ἔχειν τὸν ἱερέα, συνομιλοῦντα· εὐλογίας ἀπολαύειν, ἑτέρους ὁρᾷν ἐρχομένους ἐκεῖ;*—Hom. 6. in 1 Tim. p. 1550. (t. 11. p. 579 a.) *Καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασιν οἱ μύσται, πῶς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν γίνεται καὶ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ καὶ ἐν πρωΐᾳ· πῶς ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ βασιλέων, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων ποιούμεθα τὴν δέησιν.*

[98] Hom. 4. de Anna, t. 1. p. 995 b. (t. 4. p. 737 c.) *Καὶ πῶς δυνατόν, φησιν, ἄνθρωπον βιωτικὸν, δικαστηρίῳ προσηλωμένον, κατὰ τρεῖς ὥρας εὔχεσθαι τῆς ἡμέρας, καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἐκτρέχειν; Δυνατὸν καὶ σφόδρα εὔκολον· κἂν γὰρ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν δραμεῖν μὴ ῥᾴδιον, ἑστῶτα ἐκεῖ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, καὶ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ προσηλωμένον εὔξασθαι δυνατόν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω φωνῆς χρεία, ὡς διανοίας· οὐδὲ ἐκτάσεως χειρῶν, ὡς συντεταμένης ψυχῆς· οὐδὲ σχήματος, ἀλλὰ φρονήματος. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ Ἄννα αὕτη, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ λαμπρὰν καὶ μεγάλην ἀφῆκε φωνὴν, διὰ τοῦτο ἠκούετο, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μεγάλα ἔνδον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν ἐβόα.*

For Hannah's prayer was not heard for her loud voice, but because she cried aloud inwardly in her soul.' This seems to intimate that the Church then only observed three hours of prayer, that is, the evening and morning, and, as I conceive, the nones, or three in the afternoon. For by this time, in some places, the Church had received that hour as a stated hour of prayer; of which more by and by, [in the thirteenth section following.] Yet it was some time after this before these hours were admitted in the Gallican and Spanish Churches. For Mabillon[99] shows, out of Gregory Turonensis, that the sixth and ninth hours of prayer were not introduced into the Church of Tours till the time of Bishop Injuriosus, which was not till the year 530. And it appears from one of the Canons of Martin Bracarensis[1], that they were not in his time admitted into the Spanish Churches. For he calls only the morning and evening service 'the daily sacrifice of psalmody,' at which all clerks were obliged to be present, under pain of deposition without amendment. This argues, that as yet the other hours were not established in the Churches, but only in the monasteries, as canonical parts of the daily service.

And it is observable further, that most of the writers of the fourth age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observations of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. As St. Jerom[2], where he describes the institutions of the monasteries erected by the famous Lady Paula, says, 'they sung the psalter in order, in the morning, at the third, and sixth, and ninth hours, and at evening, and at midnight.' And giving directions in another place to Læta[3], how to educate her daughter in the monastic life, he prescribes the same hours to be observed in devotion. The like may

[99] De Cursu Gallicano, b. 3. s. 38. (p. 409.) De ecclesia Turonensi, id memoriæ prodidit Gregorius sub finem Historiæ suæ, Injuriosum episcopum ibidem instituisse Tertiam et Sextam in illa ecclesia.

[1] Capitul. Synod. c. 64. [al. 63.] (CC. t. 5. p. 912 d.) Si quis . . . clericus . . . intra civitatem fuerit, aut in quolibet loco quo ecclesia est, et ad quotidianum psallendi sacrificium . . . . non convenerit [al. convenit], deponatur a clero, &c.

[2] Epitaph. Paulæ. Ep. 27. [al. 108.] See before, ch. 4. s. 2. p. 345. n. 74.

[3] Ep. 7. [al. 107.] ad Lætam. (t. 1. p. 680 c.) Assuescat exemplo ad orationes et psalmos nocte consurgere; mane hymnos canere, tertia, sexta, nona hora stare in acie, quasi bellatricem Christi; accensaque lucernula reddere sacrificium vespertinum.

be seen in St. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Cassian, Cassiodore, and most other writers; nay, even St. Chrysostom himself, who speaks but of three solemn hours of prayer in the Church, when yet he has occasion to speak of the monks and their institutions, gives in much the same number of canonical hours as others do. He tells us[4], they had their midnight hymns, their morning prayers, their third, and sixth, and ninth hours, and last of all their evening prayers. But I will not deny, that by this time these hours of prayer might in some places of the East be admitted into the Churches. For the Author of the Constitutions has different directions upon this point: in some places[5] he speaks only of morning and evening prayer in the church; but in another[6] he prescribes this rule to be observed by the bishops in the church: 'Ye shall make prayers in the morning, and at the third hour, and at the sixth, and at the ninth, and at evening, and at cock-crowing. In the morning, giving thanks to the Lord for that he hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing in the day: at the third hour, because at that time the Lord received sentence of condemnation from Pilate: at the sixth hour, because at that time, after the Lord was crucified, all things were shaken and moved with horror and astonishment at the audacious fact of

[4] Hom. 14. in 1 Tim. p. 1599. (t. 11. p. 630 a.)... *Ἀλεκτρυὼν ἐφώνησε, καὶ εὐθέως ἐλθὼν ὁ προεστὼς, καὶ τῷ ποδὶ τὸν κείμενον ἁπλῶς ὑπονύξας, πάντας ἀνέστησεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ γυμνοὺς ἐκεῖ καθεύδειν θέμις. Εἶτα διαναστάντες εὐθέως ἑστήκασιν, ὕμνους ᾄδοντες προφητικοὺς μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς συμφωνίας, μετ' εὐρύθμων μελῶν..... Ἐκεῖνοι δὲ πάλιν εὐχὰς ἑωθινὰς ἐπιτελέσαντες καὶ ὕμνους, πρὸς τὴν τῶν Γραφῶν ἀνάγνωσιν τρέπονται..... Εἶτα τρίτην, ἕκτην, ἐννάτην, καὶ τὰς ἑσπερινὰς εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσι.*

[5] L. 2. c. 59. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 267.) *Διδάσκων δὲ, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, κέλευε καὶ παραίνει τῷ λαῷ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐνδελεχίζειν ὄρθρου καὶ ἑσπέρας ἑκάστης ἡμέρας, κ. τ. λ.*—Cf. L. 8. c. 35. See before, s. 8. n. 83, preceding.

[6] L. 8. c. 34. (ibid. p. 415.).... *Εὐχὰς ἐπιτελεῖτε ὄρθρου, καὶ τρίτῃ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἕκτῃ καὶ ἑνάτῃ καὶ ἑσπέρᾳ, καὶ ἀλεκτρυοφωνίᾳ. Ὄρθρου μὲν, εὐχαριστοῦντες, ὅτι ἐφώτισεν ὑμῖν ὁ Κύριος, παραγαγὼν τὴν νύκτα, καὶ ἐπαγαγὼν τὴν ἡμέραν· τρίτῃ δὲ, ὅτι ἀπόφασιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὑπὸ Πιλάτου ἔλαβεν ὁ Κύριος· ἕκτῃ δὲ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ ἐσταυρώθη· ἐννάτῃ δὲ, ὅτι πάντα κεκίνητο τοῦ Δεσπότου ἐσταυρωμένου, φρίττοντα τὴν τόλμαν τῶν δυσσεβῶν Ἰουδαίων, μὴ φέροντα τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ὕβιν· ἑσπέρᾳ δὲ, εὐχαριστοῦντες ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀνάπαυσιν ἔδωκε τῶν μεθημερινῶν κόπων, τὴν νύκτα· ἀλεκτρυόνων δὲ κραυγῇ, διὰ τὸ τὴν ὥραν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς ἡμέρας, εἰς ἐργασίαν τῶν τοῦ φωτὸς ἔργων. Εἰ μὴ δυνατὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προϊέναι διὰ τοὺς ἀπίστους, κατ' οἶκον συνάξεις, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε.... Εἰ μήτε ἐν οἴκῳ, μήτε ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ συναθροισθῆναι δυνατὸν, ἕκαστος παρ' ἑαυτῷ ψαλλέτω, ἀναγινωσκέτω, προσευχέσθω· ἢ καὶ ἅμα δύο, ἢ τρεῖς. Ὅπου γάρ εἰσι δύο, ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.*

the impious Jews, detesting the affront that was put upon their Lord: at evening, giving thanks to God, who hath given the night to be a rest from our daily labours: at cock-crowing, because that hour brings the welcome news of the day, to work the works of light. If you cannot go to the church because of the infidels, you shall assemble in an house: or if you can neither assemble in an house, nor in the church, then let every one sing, read, and pray by himself; or two or three together: for "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."' One may conjecture from this passage, that this author, living in the time when these canonical hours began to be in request, in the beginning of the fourth century, found them to be admitted into the usage of some Churches, and therefore drew his scheme of directions in conformity to their practice.

What service was allotted to these canonical hours by the Church in the fourth century.

9. And it being allowed, that about this time they began gradually to take place in the Church, it will not be amiss to take a short view of them in particular, and examine what parts of divine service were performed in each of them.

Cassian[7], speaking of the first institution of them in the monasteries of Mesopotamia and Palestine, where they had their first birth, says, they were appointed to be celebrated with the singing of three psalms at every meeting. And these intermixed with some prayers were the whole service. So that these were but short offices in comparison of the ancient morning and evening service. And there is reason to believe that the Church did not precisely follow these monastic rules, but made proper offices for herself to be used upon these occasions, partly because the monastic offices were very different from one another, and not always chosen with the greatest discretion. Of which I need but give one proof here out of the Council of Braga, which made a canon[8] to this purpose, that by common consent one and the same order of singing should be

[7] Instit. l. 3. c. 3. See before, s. 8. the first part of n. 89, preceding.

[8] Bracar. 1. c. 19. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 1.] (t. 5. p. 840 b.) Placuit omnibus communi consensu, ut unus atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur, et non diversæ ac privatæ monasteriorum consuetudines contra ecclesiasticas regulas sint permixtæ. [The citation is according to Crabbe, (t. 2. p. 217.): the latter part of the canon is worded thus in Labbe and Cossart: Et n. d. a. p. m. c. cum ecclesiastica regula sint permixtæ. Ed.]

observed in the morning and evening offices, and that the private and different customs of the monasteries should not be mingled with the rules of the Church.

The Gallican Church in the time of the second Council of Tours, it is certain, had a very different rule from that of the Eastern monasteries about the number of psalms, hymns, and antiphonas to be said at the several hours and times of prayer. For in one of the canons of that Council [9], about the year 567, a very peculiar order was made, 'that the method of psalmody and number of hymns should be in proportion to the number of the hours or months in which they were used: the new morning service was to be performed with six antiphonas, and two psalms in the height of summer. In September there were to be seven antiphonas and two psalms; in October, eight antiphonas and three psalms; in November, nine and three psalms; in December, ten and three psalms; and the same in January and February until Easter.' So again at the sixth hour there were to be six psalms and the hallelujah, and at the twelfth hour twelve psalms and the hallelujah. And in the whole month of August there should be *manications*, that is, as Mabillon [10] explains it out of Aimoinus [11], *early matins* or *morning service without any psalms*, because it was harvest time, and men were in haste to be gone to their labour, when they had performed the solemnity of the festivals, which in that month were frequent above others. This shows that no certain rule was at first observed about these canonical hours,

[9] C. 19. [al. 18.] (ibid. p. 857 b.) Iste ordo psallendi servetur, ut in diebus æstivis [al. festis] ad matutinum sex antiphonæ binis psalmis explicentur. Toto Augusto manicationes fiant, quia festivitates sunt et missæ [sanctorum]: Septembri septem antiphonæ explicentur binis psalmis; Octobri, octo ternis psalmis; Novembri, novem ternis psalmis; Decembri, decem ternis psalmis; Januario et Februario, itidem usque ad Pascha...Superest, ut vel duodecim psalmi expediantur ad matutinum, quia patrum statuta præceperunt ut ad sextam sex psalmi dicantur cum alleluia; et ad duodecimam duodecim, itemque cum alleluia, &c.

[10] De Cursu Gallicano, n. 54. (p. 422.) Quid consequentiæ est, ut quia toto Augusto mane surgebatur ob frequentes festivitates, nulli psalmi ad hunc mensem præscribantur? Fortasse quod missæ sanctorum tunc summo mane dicerentur ob messis necessitatem.

[11] Hist. Francor. l. 3. c. 81. (ap. Hist. Franc. Scriptores, t. 3. p. 87. juxt. Ed. Du Chesne. Paris. 1636–49.) Porro toto Augusto, propter crebas festivitates, manicationes fiebant. Manicare autem mane surgere dicitur. [Du Fresne, Glossar. Latinit., makes the word equivalent to ὀρθρίζειν. Ed.]

but that they varied both as to their number and service in their first original.

Of the *matutina*, or *prima*, called *the new morning service.*

10. The first of these offices was the *matutina*, or *prima, the new morning service*, so called in contradistinction to the old morning service, which was always early before day; whereas this was after the day was begun. Cassian[12] tells us, this was first set up in the monastery of Bethlehem, for till that time the morning service used to end with the old nocturnal psalms and prayers and the daily vigils, after which they used to betake themselves to rest till the third hour, which was the first hour of diurnal prayer, till this new office of morning prayer was set up within Cassian's memory, to prevent some inconveniences, which he there mentions. He often gives it the name therefore of *novella solemnitas, the new solemnity*, as being so lately invented. And this is the true reason why in most of the writers before Cassian, such as St. Jerom, the Author of the Constitutions, St. Basil, and others, who speak particularly of the canonical hours, there is no mention of this first hour, but they always reckon them up after this manner, the morning, (meaning the morning vigil before day,) the third, the sixth, the ninth, without mentioning the first, because it was not in their time as yet become an accustomed hour of prayer. But when it was once made a canonical hour, to complete the number of seven times a day, then there were Psalms particularly appointed for this service, which Cassian[13] says were these three, the fiftieth, sixty-second, and eighty-ninth; which, according to our computation, are the fifty-first, sixty-third, and ninetieth. The first of which is that which the Ancients called properly *the Psalm of Confession*, or *Penitential Psalm*, which begins, "Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies do away mine offences." This, Cassian says in the same place[14], was used by all the Churches of Italy in his time as the close of this morning service. The second of these Psalms is that which the Ancients called by a peculiar name,

[12] Instit. l. 3. c. 4. See before, s. 8. n. 91, preceding.

[13] Ibid. c. 6. (p. 40.) Quinquagesimum vero Psalmum, et sexagesimum secundum, et octogesimum nonum huic novellæ solemnitati novimus fuisse deputatos.

[14] [Ibid. c. 6. (p. 41.) Denique per Italiam hodieque consummatis matutinalibus hymnis quinquagesimus Psalmus in universis ecclesiis canitur. *Grischov.*]

the Morning Psalm, as we shall see hereafter, [in the first section of the next chapter,] because it begins with those words, "O God, my God, early will I awake unto thee," or "early will I seek thee!" and was always used in the old antelucan service before this new service was set up. The third of these Psalms, which is the ninetieth, seems to be taken into this service upon the account of those words in it suiting the state of human life, "In the morning it is green, and groweth up, but in the evening it is cut down, dried up, and withered:" and, "So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

Of the tertia, or third hour of prayer.

11. Next after this, in all such Churches as admitted the first, was the *tertia,* or *third hour,* that is, *nine in the morning;* this is mentioned by all the writers[15] that say any thing of hours of prayer; some saying it was to be observed in regard to our Saviour's being condemned by Pilate at that time; and others[16], in memory of the Holy Ghost's coming upon the Apostles at that hour; that men might with one mind worship the Holy Spirit, and beg of him the same sanctification, direction, and protection, imitating David's prayer, in saying, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." (Psal. 51, 10.) In another place, "Let thy loving Spirit lead me forth into the land of righteousness;" [or thus, "Thy Spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness."] (Psal. 143, 10.) This is the reason assigned by Cassian and St. Basil for this solemnity. But whether any particular Psalms were appropriated to this service, we are not told, but only in general, Cassian says, three Psalms, together with prayers, were appointed for every hour. But on all festivals this ser-

[15] Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 34. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 415.)...Τρίτῃ δὲ, ὅτε ἀπόφασιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὑπὸ Πιλάτου ἔλαβεν ὁ Κύριος, κ.τ.λ. See before, n. 6.

[16] Basil. Regul. Major. quæst. 37. [ap. Respons.] (t. 2. part. 1. p. 536 c. n. 3.) Πάλιν δὲ κατὰ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν εἰς τὴν προσευχὴν ἀνίστασθαι, καὶ ἐπισυνάγειν τὴν ἀδελφότητα, κἂν τύχωσιν ἄλλοι πρὸς ἄλλα ἔργα μεμερισμένοι· καὶ ὑπομνησθέντας τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δωρεᾶς, τῆς κατὰ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις δεδομένης, προσκυνῆσαι πάντας ὁμοθυμαδὸν, εἰς τὸ ἀξίους γενέσθαι καὶ αὐτοὺς τῆς ὑποδοχῆς τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ, καὶ αἰτοῦντας τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁδηγίαν, καὶ διδασκαλίαν πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα, Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοὶ, ὁ Θεὸς, κ. τ. λ. καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ. Τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Ἅγιον, μὴ ἀνταναιρῆς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.—Cassian. Instit. l. 3. c. 3. (p. 32.) Hora namque tertia repromissus olim per Prophetas Spiritus Sanctus super Apostolos, in orationum officio constitutos, descendisse primitus comprobatur.

vice was omitted, because on Sundays the communion-service was used, which always began at this hour.

Of the sixth hour, or noon-day service.

12. The next hour was the sixth, or noon-day service. At which time, St. Basil[17] says, they used the 90th [the 91st according to the authorized Version,] Psalm, praying for protection against the incursions of *the noon-day devil*, δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ: for so the Septuagint[18] and other translations render the words of that Psalm, "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, nor for the arrow that flieth by day; nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness, nor for the sickness, nor for the devil destroying [or, the destruction that wasteth] at noon-day." What other Psalms they used he tells us not, but probably they might be some that had relation to the death of Christ, because it is agreed by all that this service was appointed in commemoration of our Saviour's immaculate sacrifice to the Father at this hour.

Of the ninth hour, or three in the afternoon.

13. The last hour of prayer in the day-time was the ninth hour, that is, *three in the afternoon*, at which time our Saviour expired upon the cross, and by his death triumphed over death and hell. At this hour Cornelius was praying, when he was visited by an angel: as Peter was at the sixth hour, when he had the vision of the sheet let down from heaven. This was the hour when Peter and John went up into the temple, "at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer," and the usual time of the Jewish evening sacrifice. In regard to all which, the Church seems to have taken this hour for a solemn time of public prayer, before the two last mentioned. For the Council of Laodicea[19] expressly mentions the ninth hour of prayer, and orders that the same service should be used in that as was appointed for evening prayer. And St. Chrysostom[20], speaking

[17] Regul. Major. quæst. 37. [ap. Respons.] (t. 2. part. 1. p. 536 e. n. 4.) Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἕκτῃ ὥρᾳ, κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἁγίων, ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι τὴν προσευχὴν ἐκρίναμεν, τῶν λεγόντων· Ἑσπέρας, καὶ πρωΐ, καὶ μεσημβρίας διηγήσομαι, καὶ ἀπαγγελῶ, καὶ εἰσακούσεται τῆς φωνῆς μου· καὶ ὥστε ῥυσθῆναι ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ, ἅμα καὶ τοῦ Ψαλμοῦ τοῦ ἐννενηκοστοῦ λεγομένου.

[18] [Ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ. (juxt. Ed. Lambert. Bos. Franequer. 1709.)—Conf. ibid. var. lect. (ad calc. p. 778.) *Aquil.* Ἀπὸ δηγμοῦ δαιμονίζοντος μεσημβρίας. *Symmach.* Συγκύρημα δαιμονιῶδες μεσημβρίας.—Ab incursu et *dæmonio meridiano*, is also the reading of the Vulgate. Ed.]

[19] C. 18. (t. 1. p. 1500 b.) Περὶ τοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν εὐχῶν πάντοτε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐννάταις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑσπέραις ὀφείλειν γίνεσθαι.

[20] Hom. 14. in 1 Tim. p. 1599. See before. s. 8. n. 4, preceding.

of three hours of public prayer in the day, may most reasonably be understood to intend this ninth hour as the third of them; because in another place[21] he seems to recommend it as such: for, speaking of the Apostles going into the temple at the ninth hour, being the hour of prayer, he says; 'They observed this hour not without very good reason; for I have often told you concerning this hour that it was the time when Paradise was opened, and the thief entered into it; this the time when the curse was taken away, when the sacrifice of the world was offered, when the darkness was dissolved, and the light, as well sensible as spiritual, shone forth. It was at the ninth hour, when others after dinner and drunkenness sleep a deep sleep, that they then being sober and vigilant, and fervent in love, made haste to prayer. And if they needed to be so exact and assiduous in prayer, who had such boldness, and were conscious of no evil; what shall we do, who are overrun with wounds and sores, and neglect to use the medicine of prayer?' This character here given of the ninth hour makes it probable to me that this was one of those three famous hours of prayer, which in the former place he exhorts all men to frequent in public. We have no particular account in any writer of the psalms or prayers to be used at this hour, but only what we have heard before out of the Council of Laodicea, that it was to be the same with the evening service: and therefore we must draw our accounts of it from thence.

Now because we have a more ample and distinct account of the morning and evening daily service than of any other stated hours of prayer in the ancient Church, as being both more ancient and more celebrated than the rest, I shall give a more particular and exact description of the several parts, and me-

[21] Hom. 12. de Inscript. Act. Apost. t. 5. p. 176. (t. 3. p. 67 e.) *Εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσεύξασθαι περὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς τὴν ἐννάτην· οὐδὲ ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῖς ἁπλῶς παρατετήρηται· καὶ γὰρ εἶπον ὑμῖν πολλάκις περὶ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ Παράδεισος ἀνεῴγη, καὶ ὁ λῃστὴς εἰσῆλθεν, ἐν αὐτῇ ἡ κατάρα ἀνῃρέθη, ἐν αὐτῇ ἡ θυσία τῆς οἰκουμένης προσηνέχθη, ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ σκότος ἐλύθη, ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ φῶς ἔλαμψε, καὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ τὸ νοητόν· περὶ ὥραν ἐννάτην, ὅτε ἕτεροι ἀπὸ ἀρίστου καὶ μέθης καθεύδουσιν ὕπνον βαθὺν, τότε ἐκεῖνοι νήφοντες, καὶ διεγηγερμένοι, καὶ πολλῷ τῷ πόθῳ ζέοντες, ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν ἔσπευδον. Εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνοι εὐχῆς ἐδέοντο, εὐχῆς οὕτω ἐκτενοῦς, εὐχῆς οὕτω διηκριβωμένης, οἱ τοσαύτην ἔχοντες παρρησίαν, οἱ μηδὲν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδότες πονηρὸν, τί ποιήσομεν ἡμεῖς, μυρίων γέμοντες τραυμάτων, οὐκ ἐπιτιθέντες δὲ τῆς εὐχῆς φάρμακον;*

thod of performing those offices, from such records as may be depended on for their truth and fidelity; and have therefore reserved the consideration of these for the two following chapters.

CHAP. X.

The order of their daily morning service.

The order of morning service, as described in the Constitutions. This began with the 63rd Psalm.

1. THE most noted and usual times of meeting, besides those of the Lord's-day, were the morning and evening of every day, which in times of peace were constantly and regularly observed. I will describe the order of these services, as they are laid down in the Constitutions, and cōmpare the several parts of them with the memorials and accounts, that are left us by other ancient writers.

The order for the morning service begins with the appointment of the Ὀρθρινὸς Ψαλμὸς, *the Morning Psalm*, as the Author of the Constitutions[21] terms it. He names not what Psalm it was in this place, but in another place[22] he calls it the sixty-second; that is, in our division, the sixty-third. Which, to show how proper it was to begin their morning service with, both in relation to the night past, and the day approaching, I think it not improper to recite in this place, according to our old version, which comes nearest to the translation of the Septuagint used in the ancient Church.

PSALM LXIII.

1. O God, thou art my God: early will I seek thee.

2. My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh also longeth after thee, in a barren and dry land, where no water is.

3. Thus have I looked for thee in holiness; that I might behold thy power and glory.

4. For thy loving-kindness is better than the life itself: my lips shall praise thee.

5. As long as I live will I magnify thee on this manner, and lift up my hands in thy name.

[21] L. 8. c. 37. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 417.) Ὡσαύτως ὄρθρου, μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ὀρθρινὸν, κ. τ. λ.

[22] L. 2. c. 59. (ibid. p. 267.) ... Ἑκάστης ἡμέρας συναθροίζεσθε ὄρθρου καὶ ἑσπέρας, ψάλλοντες καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς· ὄρθρου μὲν λέγοντες Ψαλμὸν τὸν ξβ'· ἑσπέρας δὲ τὸν ρμ'.

6. My soul shall be satisfied even as it were with marrow and fatness, when my mouth praiseth thee with joyful lips.

7. Have I not remembered thee in my bed, and thought upon thee when I was waking?

8. Because thou hast been my helper, therefore under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice.

9. My soul hangeth upon thee: thy right hand hath upholden me.

10. These also that seek the hurt of my soul, they shall go under the earth.

11. Let them fall [Septuagint[23], They shall fall] upon the edge of the sword, that they may be a portion for foxes.

12. But the king shall rejoice in God; all they also that swear by him shall be commended: for the mouth of them that speak lies[24] shall be stopped.

What notice we have of this Morning Psalm in other writers.

2. St. Chrysostom shows that the Author of the Constitutions does not impose upon us in this Morning Psalm: for he says[25], 'The Fathers of the Church appointed it to be said every morning, as a spiritual song and medicine to blot out our sins; to kindle in us a desire of God; to raise our souls, and inflame them with a mighty fire of devotion; to make us overflow with goodness and love, and send us with such preparation to approach and appear before God.' He names not the Psalm, but he repeats the first words, "O God, my God, early will I awake unto thee. My soul thirsteth for thee:" and, "Thus have I appeared before thee in holiness, that I might behold thy power and glory:" by which we may know that it is the same Psalm. He says, he had before made an exposition upon this Psalm; and refers his reader thither for a large account of it: but that by injury of time is now lost, and we are beholden to this passage by the by for all the notice we have of this Morning Psalm out of him, upon the occasion of his commenting upon the Evening Psalm; of which more here-

23 [Ps. 62, 10. *Παραδοθήσονται εἰς χεῖρας ῥομφαίας, μερίδες ἀλωπέκων ἔσονται.* Ed.]

24 [Sept., *ἄδικα.* Ed.]

25 In Ps. 140. t. 3. p. 545. (t. 5. p. 427 c.) *Τοιοῦτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἑωθινὸς Ψαλμός. . . . τὸν πόθον γὰρ ἀνάπτει τὸν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ διεγείρει τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ σφόδρα πυρώσας, καὶ πολλῆς ἐμπλήπας ἀγαθότητος, καὶ ἀγάπης, οὕτως ἀφίησι προσελθεῖν. Ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ πόθεν ἄρχεται, καὶ τί διδάσκει ἡμᾶς· Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός μου, πρός σε ὀρθρίζω, ἐδίψησέ σε ἡ ψυχή μου· . . . οὕτως ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὤφθην σοι, τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὴν δύναμίν σου, καὶ τὴν δόξαν σου.*

after in its proper place, [in the second section of the next chapter.]

Besides Chrysostom, we have the testimony of Cassian[16] for the use of this Psalm; for, speaking of the several hours of prayer, and assigning reasons out of Scripture for them, he makes this to be one reason for morning prayer, that the Psalm, which was daily sung in that office, did properly instruct men about their obligations to this duty, saying, "O God, my God, early will I seek thee!" And Athanasius also once or twice recommends this Psalm to virgins and others, as proper to be said privately in their morning devotions. 'Rising early in the morning,' says he to Marcellinus[17], 'sing the sixty-second Psalm.' And again[18], to the virgins; 'In the morning sing this Psalm, O God, my God, early will I seek thee!' These were but private directions indeed, but probably might be suited to the orders and measures of public worship: it being evident from the forecited authors, that this Psalm was the usual introduction to their morning devotions.

Next to the Psalm followed the prayers for the catechumens, energumens, competentes, and penitents.

3. Immediately after this Morning Psalm, without mention of any other psalmody or reading any lessons out of the Old or New Testament, follow the prayers for the several orders or catechumens, energumens, candidates of baptism, and penitents, as in the general service of the Lord's-day, which, because I shall recite them at large in that service[19], I omit to mention any further in this place. Only observing, that these prayers were performed partly by the deacon's προσφώνησις, bidding the people pray, and repeating the several petitions they were to make for those several orders of men; and partly by the bishop's invocation or benediction said over them, as they bowed down to receive the blessing before their dismission.

Then the prayers for the faithful, the peace of the world, and the whole state

4. When these several orders were sent away, there followed the prayers, which on the Lord's-day began the communion-service, and which upon that account were usually styled εὐχαὶ πιστῶν, *the prayers of the faithful*, or *communicants*, because none but they, who had a right to communicate in the eucha-

[16] Instit. l. 3. c. 3. (p. 33.) De matutina vero solemnitate etiam illud nos instruit, quod in ipsa quotidie decantari solet, *Deus, Deus meus ad te de luce vigilo.*

[17] De Interpret. Psalmor. See before, ch. 5. s. 7. p. 407. n. 49.

[18] De Virgin. t. 1. p. 1057. See ibid. n. 50.

[19] See b. 14. ch. 5. next vol.

rist, might be present at them. These were the prayers for the peace of the world, and all orders of men in the Church, which always went before the consecration of the eucharist. And though there were no consecration of the eucharist on these ordinary days, yet these general prayers were always used in the daily morning service. I omit the reciting of them here for the same reason as I do the former, because the reader may find them rehearsed at large hereafter[20] in the entrance on the communion-service.

of Christ's Church.

5. I only observe here, that there is mention made, in other writers as well as in the Constitutions, of these prayers for the whole state of the world and all orders of men in the Church. For Chrysostom[21], writing upon those words of St. Paul, "I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in authority, &c.," says, 'This word, *first of all*, relates to the daily worship; wherein they that were initiated know what was done every day, morning and evening; how we make supplication to God for the whole world, *for kings and all that are in authority*.' This clearly shows that such prayers were not only made on communion-days at the celebration of the eucharist, but every day, both morning and evening also, when it is certain there could be no sacrifice but only that of their prayers. For the consecration of the eucharist, in that age, was never made at evening prayer[22].

What notice we have of these prayers in other writers.

In this sense we may understand many of the ancient Apologists, when they speak of 'making prayers continually for the Roman government.' Thus Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, tells Æmilian the præfect[23], 'We worship the one God, maker of all things, who gave the empire to Valerian and Gallienus,

[20] See b. 15. ch. 1. next vol.

[21] Hom. 6. in 1 Tim. [2. 1, 2.] p. 1550. (t. 11. p. 579 a.) Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ, Πρῶτον πάντων; τουτέστιν, ἐν τῇ λατρείᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ, κ.τ.λ. See the rest as cited before, ch. 9. s. 8. p. 545. the latter part of n. 97.

[22] [Except in the Churches of Epypt and Thebais, according to the testimony of Socrates. See before, ch. 9. s. 3. p. 527. n. 22.—Possibly in those cases they partook of *presanctified elements*, which had been previously consecrated in the morning: but I have no authority for this suggestion. Ed.]

[23] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 335. 13.) Ἡμεῖς τοίνυν τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν καὶ Δημιουργὸν τῶν ἁπάντων, τὸν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐγχειρήσαντα τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις .... σεβαστοῖς, τοῦτον καὶ σέβομεν καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, καὶ τούτῳ διηνεκῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν, ὅπως ἀσάλευτος διαμένῃ, προσευχόμεθα.

our divine governors: to him we pray continually for their kingdom, that it may be preserved free from disturbance and commotion.' And so Tertullian acquaints Scapula[23]: 'We offer sacrifice for the Emperor's safety, but to no other God but our God and his; and in that manner as God has appointed, that is to say, by prayer alone without blood.' In like manner Cyprian tells Demetrian[24]: 'We continually pour forth supplications and prayers for driving away your enemies, and procuring rain, and either for removing or moderating your calamities: and we pray instantly and incessantly day and night for your peace and safety, appeasing God and rendering him propitious unto you.' Origen also answering the objection of Celsus, that the Christians were wanting in their duty to the Emperor, in that they gave him no aid in his wars, and refused to fight for him, among other things tells him[25], 'that they gave him the most seasonable assistance, procuring him the divine aid, and defending him with the whole armour of God. And this they did in obedience to the Apostle's admonition: "I exhort therefore first of all, that supplications,

[23] C. 2. (p. 69 c.)... Sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius: sed quo modo præcepit Deus, pura prece.—Conf. Apol. c. 30. (p. 27 a.) Nos enim pro salute imperatorum Deum invocamus æternum, Deum verum, Deum vivum, &c.—It. c. 31. (p. 27 c.) Qui ergo putaveris nihil nos de salute Cæsarum curare, inspice Dei voces, &c.—It. c. 39. (p. 31 a.) Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.

[24] P. 193. (p. 134.) Pro arcendis hostibus et imbribus impetrandis, et vel auferendis vel temperandis adversis, rogamus semper et preces fundimus: et pro pace ac salute vestra propitiantes ac placantes Deum, diebus ac noctibus jugiter atque instanter oramus.

[25] Cont. Cels. [l. 8. n. 73.] p. 426. (t. 1. p. 796 f.) Εἶθ' ἐξῆς προτρέπεται ἡμᾶς ὁ Κέλσος, ἀρήγειν τῷ βασιλεῖ παντὶ σθένει, καὶ συμπονεῖν αὐτῷ τὰ δίκαια, καὶ ὑπερμαχεῖν αὐτοῦ, καὶ συστρατεύειν αὐτῷ, ἂν ἐπείγῃ καὶ συστρατηγεῖν· Λεκτέον δὲ καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα, ὅτι ἀρήγομεν κατὰ καιρὸν τοῖς βασιλεῦσι, θείαν, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, ἄρηξιν καὶ πανοπλίαν ἀναλαμβάνοντες Θεοῦ. Καὶ ταῦτα ποιοῦμεν, πειθόμενοι ἀποστολικῇ φωνῇ, λεγούσῃ, Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς πρῶτον ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχὰς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων· καὶ ὅσῳ γέ τις εὐσεβέστερός ἐστιν, τοσούτῳ ἀνυτικώτερος ἐν τῷ ἀρήγειν τοῖς βασιλεύουσι παρὰ τοὺς εἰς τὰς παρατάξεις ἐξιόντας στρατιώτας, καὶ ἀναιροῦντας οὓς ἂν δύνωνται τῶν πολεμίων. . . . . Καὶ οὗτοι στρατεύονται ὡς ἱερεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ θεραπευταί, καθαρὰς μὲν τηροῦντες τὰς δεξιὰς, ἀγωνιζόμενοι δὲ διὰ τῶν πρὸς Θεὸν εὐχῶν, ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίως στρατευομένων, καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίως βασιλεύοντος, ἵνα τὰ ἐναντία πάντα, καὶ ἐχθρὰ τοῖς δικαίως πράττουσι, καθαιρεθῇ. Ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ, ταῖς εὐχαῖς πάντας δαίμονας, τοὺς ἐγείροντας τὰ πολεμικὰ, καὶ ὅρκους συγχέοντας, καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην ταράσσοντας, καθαιροῦντες, μᾶλλον βοηθοῦμεν τοῖς βασιλεύουσιν, ἥπερ οἱ δοκοῦντες στρατεύεσθαι.

prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and all that are in authority."' He adds, 'that keeping their hands pure, they fought in their prayers to God for their lawful sovereign and those that fought lawfully under him, that all opposition and enemies might fall before them, whilst they were lawfully employed. They by their prayers enervated the power of devils, the authors of war, and confounders of leagues, and disturbers of peace; and in doing this they did the Emperor more effectual service than they that bare arms for him.' Athenagoras[26] tells the Emperors themselves in his Address to them, 'that the Christians prayed for their government and the royal progeny, that the son might succeed the father in his kingdom according to right, and that their empire might be extended and enlarged, all things succeeding according to their desire: and this they did, both that they might lead a quiet and peaceable life, and cheerfully observe all that was commanded them.'

Now, though in all these passages there is no express mention made of morning and evening prayer in the Church, yet 'their continual prayer,' and 'their praying day and night,' may reasonably be presumed to include these, without any prejudice to other times of public or private devotion. I now go on again with the order of morning prayer in the Constitutions.

After the general prayer for the whole state of the Church, followed a short bidding-prayer for preservation in

6. After the prayer for the whole state of the Church was ended, and the deacon had said[27], Keep us, O God, and preserve us by thy grace! which concludes the former prayer, he exhorted the people to pray for peace and prosperity the day ensuing and all their lives, in this manner[28]:

'Let us beg of God his mercies and compassions, that this morning, and this day, and all the time of our pilgrimage, may

[26] Legat. pro Christian. (ad calc. Just. Mart. p. 39. lin. ult.) Περὶ μὲν τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐχόμεθα, ἵνα παῖς μὲν παρὰ πατρὸς κατὰ τὸ δικαιότατον διαδέχησθε τὴν βασιλείαν, αὔξησιν δὲ καὶ ἐπίδοσιν καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ ὑμῶν, πάντων ὑποχειρίων γιγνομένων, λαμβάνῃ. Τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἥρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγοιμεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ πάντα τὰ κεκελευσμένα προθύμως ὑπηρετοῖμεν.

[27] [Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 37. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 417.) Σῶσον αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἀνάστησον ἐν τῇ χάριτί σου.

[28] Ibid. (p. ead.) Αἰτησώμεθα παρὰ Κυρίου τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμούς· τὸν ὄρθρον τοῦτον καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, εἰρηνικὴν καὶ ἀναμάρτητον, καὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον τῆς παρεπιδημίας ἡμῶν· τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης· Χριστιανὰ τὰ τέλη· ἵλεων καὶ εὐμενῆ τὸν Θεόν· ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀλλήλους τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ παραθώμεθα. *Grischov.*]

the ensuing day.

be passed by us in peace and without sin. Let us beg of God that he would send us the angel of peace, and give us a Christian end, and be gracious and merciful unto us. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the living God by his only begotten Son.'

What is here said concerning *the angel of peace*, is a petition, that came often in the devotions of the ancient Church, both when they prayed for themselves and others. For we shall meet with it again in the evening service, and in the prayer for the catechumens, mentioned by St. Chrysostom in several places[29] of his writings, where he often speaks of 'the deacon bidding men pray for the angel of peace, and that all their purposes may be directed to a peaceable end,' which agree very well with this prayer of the deacon in the Constitutions.

Then the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving.

7. Immediately after this common prayer of the deacon and people together, the deacon having bid the people commend themselves to God, the bishop makes this commendatory prayer, which is there[30] called εὐχαριστία ὀρθρινὴ, *the morning thanksgiving*, and is in the following words:

'O God, the God of spirits and of all flesh, with whom no one can compare, whom no one can approach, that givest the sun to govern the day, and the moon and the stars to govern the night; look down now upon us with the eyes of thy favour, and receive our morning thanksgivings, and have mercy on us. For we have not spread forth our hands to any strange God. For there is not any new God among us, but thou, our eternal and immortal God, who hast given us our being through Christ, and our well-being through him also. Vouchsafe by him to bring us to everlasting life, with whom unto thee be glory, honour and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.'

[29] See these places of Chrysostom cited afterwards, b. 14. ch. 5. s. 4.

[30] L. 8. c. 38. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 417.) Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκὸς, ὁ ἀσύγκριτος καὶ ἀπροσδεὴς, ὁ δοὺς τὸν ἥλιον εἰς ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἡμέρας, τὴν δὲ σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἄστρα εἰς ἐξουσίαν τῆς νυκτός· αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν ἔπιδε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς εὐμενέσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ πρόσδεξαι τὰς ἑωθινὰς ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίας, καὶ ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς· οὐ γὰρ διεπετάσαμεν τὰς χεῖρας ἡμῶν πρὸς θεὸν ἀλλότριον· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν θεὸς πρόσφατος, ἀλλὰ σὺ ὁ Αἰώνιος καὶ Ἀτελεύτητος· ὁ τὸ εἶναι ἡμῖν διὰ Χριστοῦ παρασχόμενος, καὶ τὸ εὖ εἶναι δι' αὐτοῦ δωρησάμενος. Αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ καταξίωσον καὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς· μεθ' οὗ σοι δόξα, καὶ τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

8. After this the deacon bids them bow their heads and receive the imposition of hands, or the bishop's benediction, which follows under the title of χειροθεσία ὀρθρινή, *the imposition of hands in morning prayer*, in the form of words here annexed [31].

And his imposition of hands or benediction, with the deacon's dismission of the assembly.

'O God, faithful and true, that showest mercy to thousands and ten thousands of them that love thee; who art the friend of the humble and defender of the poor, whose aid all things stand in need of, because all things serve thee: look down upon this thy people, who bow their heads unto thee, and bless them with thy spiritual benediction; keep them as the apple of the eye; preserve them in piety and righteousness, and vouchsafe to bring them to eternal life, in Christ Jesus thy beloved Son, with whom unto thee be glory, honour and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, world without end. Amen.'

This said, the deacon dismisses the congregation with the usual form, Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Depart in peace!* Which Chrysostom takes notice of as the solemn word for dismissing every church-assembly. For, speaking of the frequent use of the salutation, *Pax vobis, Peace be unto you!*, he observes, that as it was used in the beginning of every sacred action, prayer, preaching, blessing, &c., and sometimes in the middle of prayers too, so it was particularly at the bishop's entrance into the church, and the deacon's final dismission of the assembly. 'The deacon,' says he [32], 'when he sends you away from this meeting, does it with this prayer, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Go in peace!*'

9. But besides this order of morning prayer laid down in this place by the author of the Constitutions, there is in another place a prayer or hymn appointed for the morning, but

Whether the morning hymn was part of the

[31] [Ibid. c. 39. (p. 417.) Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς, ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος εἰς χιλιάδας καὶ μυριάδας τοῖς ἀγαπῶσί σε, ὁ φίλος ταπεινῶν, καὶ πενήτων προστάτης, οὗ πάντα ἐν χρείᾳ καθέστηκεν, ὅτι τὰ σύμπαντα δοῦλά σου, ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου τοῦτον, τοὺς κεκλικότας σοι τὰς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλὰς, καὶ εὐλόγησον αὐτοὺς εὐλογίαν πνευματικήν· φύλαξον αὐτοὺς ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ· διατήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ καταξίωσον αὐτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ σου παιδί· μεθ' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας, καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

[32] Hom. 52. In eos qui Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 713. [al. Cont. Judæos, Hom. 3.] (t. 1. p. 614 c.) Ὁ διάκονος . . . τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἀπολύων ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἐπεύχεται, λέγων· Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

public service every day.

whether for public or private use is not said: I suppose he intended it only for private devotion, because it is placed among many other private prayers. He gives it the name of *προσευχὴ ἑωθινὴ, the morning prayer.* Other writers call it *the hymn,* and *the angelical hymn,* and *the great doxology,* from the first words of it, Glory be to God on high! which was the angels' hymn at our Saviour's birth. The form of it in this author[33] runs in these words:

'Glory be to God on high, in earth peace, good-will towards men! We praise thee, we laud thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we worship thee, by the great High-Priest; thee, the true God, the only Unbegotten, whom no one can approach for thy great glory. O Lord, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty, Lord God, the Father of Christ, the immaculate Lamb, who taketh away the sin of the world, receive our prayer, thou that sittest upon the Cherubims! For thou only art holy, thou only, Lord Jesus, the Christ of God, the God of every created being, and our King; by whom unto thee be glory, honour and adoration!'

This same hymn is mentioned also by Athanasius, in his Book *De Virginitate*[34], but he gives it only as a direction to virgins in their private devotions: 'Early in the morning,' says he, 'sing this Psalm, O God, my God, early will I awake unto thee. My soul thirsteth for thee! (that is the 63rd Psalm.) When it is light say, Bless ye the Lord, all ye works of the Lord! (that is the Song of the Three Children.) And, Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men! We laud thee! we bless thee! we worship thee!' and what follows. It is great pity this author did not give us the whole hymn,

[33] L. 7. c. 47. [al. 48.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 385 d.) Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Αἰνοῦμέν σε, ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, δοξολογοῦμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε, διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως· σὲ τὸν ὄντα Θεὸν, ἀγέννητον ἕνα, ἀπρόσιτον μόνον διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν. Κύριε βασιλεῦ ἐπουράνιε, Θεὲ Πάτερ παντοκράτορ, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀμώμου ἀμνοῦ, ὃς αἴρει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβίμ. Ὅτι σὺ μόνος Ἅγιος· σὺ μόνος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάσης γενητῆς φύσεως, τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας.

[34] De Virgin. t. 1. p. 1057. (t. 2. p. 93 c. n. 20.) Πρὸς ὄρθρον δὲ τὸν Ψαλμὸν τοῦτον λέγετε· Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός μου, πρός σε ὀρθρίζω· ἐδίψησέ σε ἡ ψυχή μου. Διάφαυμα δέ. Εὐλογεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον. Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. Ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογουμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε· καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

that we might have compared it with that in the Constitutions. It was always used in the communion-service, though not exactly in the same form, as we shall see hereafter[34]. But St. Chrysostom speaks of it as used also daily at morning prayer. For, describing the devotions of those who led an ascetic life[35], he says, 'As soon as they rose out of bed, they met together and made a choir, and as it were with one mouth sang hymns to God, praising him, and giving him thanks for all his blessings both general and particular: and among other things like angels on earth, singing, Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men!' And Mabillon observes[36] out of the Rules of Cæsarius Arelatensis and Aurelian in the beginning of the sixth century, that it is there appointed to be sung at matins or morning prayer every Lord's-day, and on Easter-day, and such other noted festivals. Which shows, that at least in some Churches it was used in other offices beside the communion-service, and among the monks as an ordinary hymn in their daily morning service. And so it is now used among the modern Greeks, as a learned searcher of their rituals informs us in his Account of the Greek Church[37].

Whether the psalms and lessons were read at the daily morning service.

10. But it seems a little more difficult to account for another thing which is omitted in the Constitutions. For there is no order there either for psalms or lessons to be read in the morning service, besides that one Psalm, which was particularly styled *the Morning Psalm.* Whereas other authors, and particularly Cassian[38], speak of three psalms read at every assembly through all the canonical hours of the day; and he

[34] B. 14. ch. 2. s. 2.

[35] Hom. 69. [Bened. 68. al. 69.] in Matth. p. 600. (t. 7. p. 674 c.) *Ἀναστάντες εὐθέως ἀπὸ τῆς εὐνῆς φαιδροὶ καὶ γεγηθότες, καὶ χορὸν ἕνα στησάμενοι, ἐν φαιδρῷ [τῷ προσώπῳ τε καὶ] συνειδότι, συμφώνως ἅπαντες, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος, ὕμνους εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων ᾄδουσι Θεὸν, γεραίροντες αὐτὸν, καὶ χάριν εἰδότες ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων αὐτῷ, τῶν τε ἰδίων, τῶν τε κοινῶν εὐεργετημάτων.... Τί τῶν ἀγγέλων οὗτος διέστηκεν ὁ χορὸς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ᾀδόντων καὶ λεγόντων, Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.*

[36] De Cursu Gallicano, (p. 407.) Ad hæc Cæsarius et Aurelianus in matutinis laudibus canticum *Magnificat,* et hymnum *Gloria in excelsis,* pro diebus paschalibus præcipiunt, itemque pro singulis Dominicis et majoribus festivitatibus.

[37] Smith of the Greek Church, (pp. 223, 224.) That excellent hymn, ... *Glory be to God on high, &c.,* makes up a necessary part of their morning devotion upon Sundays and the other more solemn festivals, &c.

[38] Instit. l. 3. c. 3. See before, ch. 9. s. 8. p. 543, first part of n. 90.... Solemnitates trinis psalmis quotidie finiuntur, &c.

remarks precisely[39] for the morning service the very Psalms that were used, namely, the fiftieth, that is our fifty-first, which they commonly called *the Penitential Psalm:* "Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies do away my offences:" and together with that, the sixty-second Psalm, that is, the sixty-third in our division, which was commonly called *the Morning Psalm*, as we have noted before, [in the first section of the tenth chapter of this Book;] and the eighty-ninth, that is our ninetieth Psalm, which is appropriated to the funeral office, but is as proper for the service of every day, and fit to be used by all men, whenever they begin a new day, because of those excellent petitions in it for God's protection and favour, and for wisdom to consider our latter end: "So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom:" and for that it so familiarly puts us in mind of our mortality, comparing our life to a sleep, which fades away suddenly like the grass: "In the morning it is green and groweth up, but in the evening it is cut down, dried up and withered." By which we may judge both of the wisdom and piety of the Ancients in appointing this Psalm to be used constantly in the daily course of morning service. Cassian observes further in the same place[40], that in his time, throughout all the Churches of Italy, their morning hymns were concluded with the Penitential Psalm, that is, the fiftieth according to his account, but with us the fifty-first. And St. Basil[41] remarks the same thing for many of the Churches of the East, that their vigils and nocturnal psalmody were concluded, when the morning appeared, with the Psalm of Confession, by which he means no other but this same fifty-first, or Penitential Psalm, as I have evidently shown in another place[42].

What shall we say then to the Author of the Constitutions, who speaks but of one psalm in the morning service? I answer; first, no doubt there were different customs in different Churches, and in nothing did the practice vary more than in

[39] Ibid. c. 6. See before, ibid. s. 10. p. 550. n. 13.

[40] Ibid. See ibid. n. 14.

[41] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. t. 3. p. 96. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 450 c. n. 3.) Ἡμέρας ἤδη ὑπολαμπούσης . . . πάντες τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως Ψαλμὸν ἀναφέρουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ.

[42] See s. 13., of this chapter.

the rules and measures about psalmody, as we shall see more clearly hereafter, [in the first chapter of the next Book following;] so that both accounts may be very true, only applying them to the state and practice of different Churches. Secondly, I have observed before[43], that the primitive morning service, in times of persecution especially, was no other but the conclusion of the vigils, or antelucan or nocturnal service, which concluded towards break of day with some proper morning Psalm, such as the fifty-first, or sixty-third, or ninetieth, and certain prayers or collects proper to the occasion; the preceding part of the morning having been spent in psalms and hymns to a greater measure and number, sometimes ten, twelve, eighteen or twenty, and these intermingled with lessons of Scripture, and public or private prayers between them; but when the morning service was made a distinct office from the vigils, as it began to be in the fourth or fifth century, then some other Psalms were added to the morning Psalm, and three Psalms at least were read in this as well as in all other offices; and that is the reason why we meet with but one Psalm in the order for morning service in the Constitutions, and three in others, which were of later appointment. Cassian himself, who gives the best account of these things of any writer, plainly favours this observation: for he tells us in one place[44], 'that the Egyptians never admitted of any morning office distinct from their nocturnal vigils, nor of any other times of public worship, besides the evening hours and nocturnal assemblies, except on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, when they met also at the third hour, (that is, at nine in the morning,) to celebrate the communion on those days. All other times they spent in labouring privately in their cells, joining continual meditation of the Psalms and other Scriptures with their labour, and mingling short prayers and ejaculations with them; so making the whole day but one continued office of devotion, which others performed by intervals of time, and

[43] Ch. 9. ss. 4. and 10., of this book.

[44] Instit. l. 3. c. 2. (p. 30.) Apud illos etenim hæc officia, quæ Domino solvere per distinctiones horarum et temporis intervalla cum admonitione compulsoris adigimur, per totum diei spatium jugiter cum operis adjectione spontanea celebrantur .... Quamobrem, exceptis vespertinis [horis] ac nocturnis congregationibus, nulla apud eos per diem publica solemnitas absque die Sabbati vel Dominica celebratur, in quibus hora tertia sacræ communionis obtentu conveniunt.

distinction of stated hours of prayer.' In another place[45] he tells us, 'that they who first brought in this new morning office, distinct from the nocturnal, did not diminish aught of the ancient psalmody from the nocturnal service; for they continued still to conclude their vigils before break of day with the same Psalms as they were used to do before; that is, with the hundred and forty-eighth, hundred and forty-ninth, and hundred and fiftieth Psalms; only they set apart the fifty-first, sixty-third, and ninetieth Psalms for this new office of morning service.' From all which it seems very probable, that according to the difference of times and places, the number of Psalms for the morning service might vary, since there were such different methods in the observation of this solemnity, and an old and a new office, that both went by the name of morning service.

The original of antelucan, or night-assemblies, in times of persecution.

11. Having thus far described the order of the old morning service, as it lies in the Constitutions; and hinted that the morning assemblies were originally the very same with the nocturnal or antelucan meetings for divine service, which we so often read of in ancient writers: for the further illustration of this part of the Christian worship, it will be proper to inquire a little more narrowly into the nature and management of them from their first original; which is known to have had its rise from the severity of the Heathen persecutions. For the Christians, being afraid to meet publicly on the Lord's-day for divine worship, were forced to hold their assemblies in the night, meeting early in the morning before day, to avoid the observation of their enemies. This appears from that early account of Pliny[46], which he had from the mouths of some apostatizing Christians, who confessed to him, 'that the sum of their crime or error was, that they were used to meet together on a certain day before it was light, and sing an hymn to Christ as to their God.' Hence it is that the Heathen, in Mi-

[45] Ibid. c. 6. (p. 40.) Illud quoque nosse debemus, nihil a senioribus nostris, qui eandem matutinam solemnitatem addi debere censuerunt, de antiqua psalmorum consuetudine immutatum: sed eodem ordine missam, quo prius in nocturnis conventibus perpetuo celebratam. Etenim hymnos, quos in hac regione ad matutinam excepere solemnitatem, in fine nocturnarum vigiliarum, quas post gallorum cantum ante auroram finire solent, similiter hodieque decantant, id est, Psalmum centesimum quadragesimum octavum, et reliquos qui sequuntur: quinquagesimum vero Psalmum, et sexagesimum secundum, et octogesimum nonum, huic novellæ solemnitati novimus fuisse deputatos.

[46] L. 10. Ep. 97. See before, ch. 9. s. 1. p. 523. n. 12.

nucius[47], more than once objects to them their night-assemblies, and calls them 'a sculking generation, that fled from the light, being mute in public, but free in discourse with one another, when they were got into their private corners.' Celsus[48] seems to mean the same thing, when he objects to them their holding of *clancular meetings*, *συνθήκας κρύβδην*. And Tertullian, to show Christian women the inconvenience of marrying Heathens, puts them in mind of these night-assemblies. 'What husband,' says he[49], 'will be willing to suffer his wife to rise from his side, and go to the night-assemblies?' And Prudentius, describing the martyrdom of St. Laurence[50], introduces the Heathen judge telling him, 'that he had heard, how they sacrificed in silver, and had their wax lights set in gold for the use of their night-assemblies.' And this was the true original of lamps, and oil, and tapers for the use of such meetings in time of persecution.

These continued when the persecutions were over.

12. Now, though it was necessity which first gave rise to these assemblies; yet the Church in after-ages thought fit to continue them, transferring them from the Lord's-day to all other days, partly to keep up the spirit of devotion in the ascetics, or such as had betaken themselves to a stricter life; partly to give leisure and opportunity to men of a secular life to observe a seasonable time of devotion, which they might do early in the morning without any distraction; and partly to guard her children against the temptations and seduction of the Arian sect, who, with great zeal, endeavoured to promote their heresy by their psalmody in such meetings, as appears from what Socrates[51] and Sozomen[52] say of them, and what

[47] Octav. [c. 8.] p. 25. (pp. 49, 50.) ... Nocturnis congregationibus .... fœderantur. Latebrosa et lucifugax natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula.—Conf. ibid. [c. 9.] p. 27. (p. 56.) .... Occultis ac nocturnis sacris apposita suspicio.

[48] Vid. Origen. cont. Cels. l. 1. p. 4. (t. 1. p. 319 b.) *Πρῶτον τῷ Κέλσῳ κεφάλαιόν ἐστι, βουλομένῳ διαβολεῖν Χριστιανισμὸν, ὡς συνθήκας κρύβδην πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιουμένων Χριστιανῶν, παρὰ τὰ νενομισμένα.*

[49] Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 4. (p. 168 d.) Quis nocturnis convocationibus, si ita oportuerit, a latere suo adimi [al. eximi] libenter feret?—Conf. de Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus.

[50] Peristeph. Hymn. 2. de S. Laurent. Mart. vv. 69–72. (v. 1. p. 183.)

Argenteis scyphis ferunt
Fumare sacrum sanguinem;
Auroque, nocturnis sacris,
Astare fixos cereos.

[51] L. 6. c. 8. See before, ch. 9. s. 4. p. 533. n. 49.

[52] L. 8. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 336. 10.)

Sidonius Apollinaris[53] particularly notes of Theodoric, King of the Goths, that he was so eager a promoter of the Arian cause, that in his zeal for them he 'frequented their morning assemblies before day, with a small guard attending him.' Now the Catholics, having so many reasons to keep up these assemblies, not only continued them, but with great zeal encouraged them in their discourses. St. Chrysostom[54] commends the widows and virgins for frequenting the church night and day, and singing psalms in these assemblies. He says [again][55], 'Men ought to come to the sanctuary in the night, and pour out their prayers there.' In another place[56], speaking of the excellency of the city of Antioch, he says, it consisted not in its fine buildings or pillars, but in the morals of the men: 'Go into the church, and there see the excellency of the city. Go into the church, and see the poor continuing there from midnight to the morning-light.' And it is remarkable what Socrates[57] says of him, when he was bishop of Constantinople, that he made additional prayers for the nocturnal hymns, on purpose to countermine the practice of the Arians.

But I must not stand to repeat all that is said of these famous morning assemblies: for there is scarce an ecclesiastical writer[58] that has not given some hint of them, which I need

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείου αἱρέσεως, ἀφαιρεθέντες τῶν ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Θεοδοσίου βασιλείας, πρὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἐκκλησίαζον, νύκτωρ πρότερον ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις στοαῖς συνελέγοντο· καὶ, εἰς συστήματα μεριζόμενοι, κατὰ τὸν τῶν ἀντιφώνων τρόπον ἔψαλλον, ἀκροτελεύτια συντιθέντες πρὸς τὸν αὐτῶν δόξαν πεποιημένα· ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν ἕω, ταῦτα δημοσίᾳ ψάλλοντες, εἰς τοὺς τόπους ἀπῄεσαν, ἔνθα καὶ ἐκκλησίαζον· . . . . Δείσας δὲ Ἰωάννης, μή τινες τούτοις ὑπαχθῶσι τῶν ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐκκλησιαζόντων, ἐπὶ τὸν ἴσον τρόπον τῆς ψαλμῳδίας τὸν αὐτοῦ λαὸν προτρέπει.

[53] L. Ep. 2. (p. 6.) Antelucanos sacerdotum suorum cœtus minimo comitatu expetit.

[54] Hom. 30. in 1 Cor. p. 591. (t. 10. p. 274 d.) Αὗται δὲ [scil. παρθένοι καὶ χῆραι] καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ψάλλουσι καὶ πάρεισι.

[55] In Ps. 133. t. 3. p. 488. (t. 5. p. 382 b.) Διὰ τί φησιν, Ἐν νυξί; Παιδεύων ἡμᾶς, μὴ τὴν πᾶσαν αὐτὴν εἰς ὕπνον δαπανᾶν, καὶ δεικνὺς τότε καθαρωτέρας εἶναι τὰς εὐχὰς, ὅτε καὶ κουφότερος ὁ νοῦς, καὶ πλείων ἡ σχολή. Εἰ δὲ ἐν νυκτὶ παραγίνεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια δεῖ, ἐννόησον, ποίας τεύξεται συγγνώμης ὁ μηδὲ οἴκοι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον εὐχὰς ἐπιτελῶν.

[56] Hom. 4. de Verb. Esai. t. 3. p. 865. (t. 6. p. 121 b.) Τί μοι λέγεις οἰκοδομήματα καὶ κίονας; ταῦτα τῷ παρόντι συγκαταλύεται βίῳ. Εἴσελθε εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ βλέπε τῆς πόλεως τὴν εὐγένειαν· εἴσελθε, ἴδε πένητας ἐκ μεσονυκτίων μέχρι τῆς ἡμέρας παραμένοντας· βλέπε πανυχίδας ἱερὰς ἡμέρᾳ καὶ νυκτὶ συναφθείσας.

[57] L. 6. c. 7. (v. 2. p. 321. 29.) Ηὔξησε δὲ πρῶτος καὶ τὰς περὶ τοὺς νυκτερινοὺς ὕμνους εὐχάς.

[58] Vid. Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 23. See ch. 9. s. 8. p. 545. n. 96.—

not recite, but rather go on to show what were the chief exercises of these meetings, which usually began soon after midnight, and continued to the morning light.

The order of divine service, which was performed in them, as described by St. Basil.

13. St. Basil in one of his Epistles[59] gives us a pretty clear description of them, though but in general terms, whilst he makes an apology for the practices of his own Church against some, who charged them with innovation. His words are these: 'The customs,' says he, 'which now prevail among us, are consonant and agreeable to all the Churches of God. For with us the people, rising early whilst it is night, come to the house of prayer, and there with much labour and affliction and contrition and tears make confession of their sins to God. When this is done, they rise from prayer, and dispose themselves to psalmody: sometimes dividing themselves into two parts, *they answer one another in singing, or sing alternately,*—*ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις.* After this again they permit one alone to begin the Psalm, and the rest *join in the close of every verse,*—*ὑπηχοῦσι.* And thus, with this variety of psalmody, they carry on the night, *praying betwixt whiles,* or intermingling prayers with their Psalms,—*μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι.* At last, when the day begins to break forth, they all in common, *as with one mouth and one heart offer up to God the Psalm of confession,* —*τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως Ψαλμὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀναφέρουσι,*—every one making the words of this Psalm to be the expression of his own repentance.' Here we have the plain order of these nocturnal or morning devotions. 1. Confession of sins. 2. Psalms sung alternately. 3. Psalms sung by one alone. 4. Prayers

Hilar. Pictav. in Ps. 64. p. 231. See before, ch. 5. s. 7. p. 414. n. 69.—Conf. Hieron. Ep. 7. [al. 107.] ad Lætam. See before, ch. 9. s. 8. p. 546. n. 3.

[59] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. t. 3. p. 96. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 450 b. n. 3.) *Ὅτι τὰ νῦν κεκρατηκότα ἔθη πάσαις ταῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις συνῳδά ἐστι καὶ σύμφωνα. Ἐκ νυκτὸς γὰρ ὀρθρίζει παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς, καὶ ἐν πόνῳ, καὶ [ἐν] θλίψει, καὶ [ἐν] συνοχῇ δακρύων ἐξομολογούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ· τελευταῖον, [ἐξ] ἀναστάντες τῶν προσευχῶν, εἰς τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν καθίστανται· καὶ νῦν μὲν διχῇ διανεμηθέντες, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὁμοῦ μὲν τὴν μελέτην τῶν λογίων ἐντεῦθεν κρατύνοντες, ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τὴν προσοχὴν καὶ τὸ ἀμετεώριστον τῶν καρδιῶν ἑαυτοῖς διακονούμενοι. Ἔπειτα πάλιν, ἐπιτρέψαντες ἑνὶ καταρχειν τοῦ μέλους, οἱ λοιποὶ ὑπηχοῦσι, καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τῆς ψαλμῳδίας τὴν νύκτα διενέγκοντες, μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι. Ἡμέρας ἤδη ὑπολαμπούσης, πάντες κοινῇ, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος καὶ μιᾶς καρδίας, τὸν τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως Ψαλμὸν ἀναφέρουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἴδια ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος τὰ ῥήματα τῆς μετανοίας ποιούμενοι.*

between the Psalms. 5. Lastly, the common Psalm of Confession, or the Penitential Psalm, in the close of all.

Whether the first confession of sins was a public or private one, is not very certain. Some learned persons[60] take it for a public confession, like that in the beginning of our Liturgy: but I rather think it was a private confession, with which we are sure their offices generally began, as appears from a canon of the Council of Laodicea[61], where it is called *the silent prayer*, εὐχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς, of which I have given a fuller account[62] in the communion-service. The later confession was plainly a public one, made by a certain form, being no other but the fifty-first Psalm, "Have mercy on me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies, do away mine offences." For this Psalm was particularly noted among the Ancients by the name of *the Psalm of confession.* Athanasius[63] gives it this title, telling us that 'the fiftieth Psalm, which is the fifty-first in our division, is Ψαλμὸς ἐξομολογήσεως, *the Psalm of confession.*' And what further confirms this interpretation is, that this very Psalm by name is appointed to be used in the close of the matins, or morning service, which the Western Churches introduced as distinct from the nocturnal service, as Cassian[64] relates, who was an eyewitness of it.

The account of them out of Cassian.

14. What number of psalms or prayers was used in this service, is not particularly noted by St. Basil; nor perhaps was it stinted to any certain number, but according as the length of the psalms or time required. But in the Egyptian Churches they reduced it to the precise number of twelve psalms, from whence some other Churches afterwards took their model, as Cassian[65] informs us, who says, that in other regions there

[60] Hamon Lestrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, ch. 3. p. 75. (Reprint, p. 108.) To begin morning prayer, &c.

[61] C. 19. (t. 1. p. 1500 c.) Τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα, καὶ ὑποχωρησάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς· μίαν μὲν τὴν πρώτην διὰ σιωπῆς, κ. τ. λ.

[62] See b. 15. ch. 1. s. 1.

[63] Ep. ad Marcellin. de Interpret. Psalmor. t. 1. p. 975. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 794 c. n. 20.) Ἀλλ' ἥμαρτες, καὶ ἐντραπεὶς μεταγινώσκεις, καὶ ἐλεηθῆναι ἀξιοῖς· ἔχεις τοὺς τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως καὶ μετανοίας λόγους ἐν τῷ πεντηκοστῷ.

[64] Instit. l. 3. c. 6. See before, ch. 9. s. 10. p. 550. n. 13.

[65] Ibid. l. 2. c. 2. (p. 13.) Quidam enim vicenos seu tricenos psalmos, et hos ipsos antiphonarum protelatos melodiis, et adjunctione quarundam modulationum debere dici singulis noctibus censuerunt, &c.

were different rules and appointments: for some recited no less than twenty psalms, and these by way of antiphonal or alternate melody: others exceeded this number: others had eighteen: so that there were almost as many ways and rules, as there were monasteries and cells. Nay, in Egypt, before the rule was settled[66], some were for having fifty, some sixty psalms: but at last, upon mature advice[67], they fixed upon the certain number of twelve psalms, both for their evening and morning service, interposing a prayer between each Psalm, and adding two lessons, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New: which was their custom on all days, except Saturdays and Sundays, when they repeated them both out of the New Testament, the one out of St. Paul's Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles, and the other out of the Gospels, as they did also for the whole term of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. He adds further[68], that they did not use the alternate way of singing in Egypt, but only one amongst them sung with a plain and even voice, the rest sitting

[66] Ibid. c. 5. (p. 16.)... Et alii quinquagenos, alii sexagenos psalmos, nonnulli vero ne hoc quidem numero contenti excedi eum debere censerent, essetque inter eos pro religionis regula piæ contentionis sancta diversitas, ita ut tempus solemnitatis vespertinæ sacratissimæ succederet quæstioni, quotidianos orationum ritus volentibus celebrare, unus in medium psalmos Domino cantaturus exsurgit, &c.

[67] Ibid. (p. 16.) Cumque, sedentibus cunctis... et in psallentis verba omni cordis intentione defixis, undecim psalmos, orationum interjectione distinctos, contiguis [al. continuis] versibus parili pronuntiatione cantasset, duodecimum sub *Alleluia* responsione consummans, ab universorum oculis repente subtractus, quæstioni pariter et cærimoniis finem imposuit.—Ibid. c. 6. (p. 18.) Ex hinc venerabilis patrum senatus, intelligens angeli magisterio congregationibus fratrum generalem canonem non sine dispensatione Domini constitutum, decrevit hunc numerum tam in vespertinis, quam in nocturnis conventiculis custodiri, quibus lectiones geminas adjungentes, id est, unam Veteris, et aliam Novi Testamenti, tamquam a se eas traditas et velut extraordinarias, volentibus tantum, ac divinarum Scripturarum memoriam possidere assidua meditatione studentibus, addiderunt. In die vero Sabbati vel Dominico utrasque de Novo recitant Testamento, id est, unam de Apostolo vel Actibus Apostolorum, et aliam de Evangeliis. Quod etiam totis Quinquagesimæ diebus faciunt hi, quibus lectio curæ est seu memoria Scripturarum.

[68] Ibid. c. 8. (p. 20.) Illum etiam quod in hac provincia, [Gallia,] vidimus, ut uno cantante, in clausula psalmi omnes astantes concinant cum clamore, *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto,* nusquam per omnem Orientem audivimus; sed cum omnium silentio, ab eo, qui cantat, finito psalmo, orationem succedere; hac vero glorificatione Trinitatis tantummodo solere antiphonam terminari. [The old edition, Basil. 1575, referred to by the Author, reads,—*hanc glorificationem... antiphona terminari.* Ed.]

by, and attending to what was said. Neither did they answer, Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost! at the end of every psalm, but interposed a prayer which was the custom of all the East, and then at the end of the last psalm, which they called *the Hallelujah!*, they subjoined the glorification of the Trinity, which they never used but at the end of that *antiphona*, as they called the Hallelujah! in the Eastern Church. When the psalms were very long, they sometimes divided them into two or three parts, and at the end of every part made a stop to interpose a prayer[69], thinking it better to use frequent and short prayers to keep up the fervour of devotion. It does not appear that these were public prayers, but rather private, at the end of which the chief minister officiating is said *colligere precem, to make a collect*, or *prayer*, recapitulating the prayers, that were made before by the assembly in private; of which I shall have occasion to give a fuller account[70] in another place. It is noted further by Cassian[71] concerning the last of their psalms, called *the antiphona*, or *Hallelujah!*, that no psalm was ever used in this place but only one of those which had the inscription of *Hallelujah!* prefixed in the title of it, such as the one hundred and forty-fifth Psalm, and those that follow, one of which was commonly the concluding Psalm, repeated by way of *antiphona*, or *response*.

It was something particular in the manner of performing this psalmody in those Egyptian monasteries, that he that sung the psalms only stood up, but the rest heard them sitting: which Cassian[72] observes to be matter of indulgence in regard

[69] Ibid. c. 11. (p. 23.)... Ne psalmos quidem ipsos, quos in congregatione [al. congregationibus] decantant, continuata student pronuntiatione concludere: sed eos pro numero versuum duabus vel tribus intercessionibus, cum orationum interjectione divisos, distinctim particulatimque consummant.

[70] See b. 15. ch. 1. s. 1.

[71] Ibid. (p. 24.) Illud quoque apud eos omni observantia custoditur, ut in responsione *Alleluia* nullus dicatur psalmus, nisi is, qui in titulo suo *Alleluia* inscriptione prænotatur.

[72] Ibid. c. 12. (p. 24.) Hunc sane canonicum, quem prædiximus, duodenarium psalmorum numerum tali corporis quiete relevant, ut has easdem congregationum solemnitates ex more celebrantes, absque eo, qui dicturus in medium psalmos surrexerit, cuncti sedilibus humillimis insidentes ad vocem psallentis omni cordis intentione dependeant. Ita namque jejuniis et operatione totius diei noctisque lassescunt, ut, nisi hujuscemodi refectione adjuventur, ne hunc quidem numerum stantes implere prævaleant.

to their continual watchings and hard labour. And it was no less peculiar that never above four persons were allowed to repeat the twelve psalms in one assembly, and that by course[73], every one singing three in order after one another; or, if there were but three, then each sung four psalms; and if but two, each of them sung six.

This morning service much frequented by the laity as well as the clergy.

15. And thus far of the nocturnal psalmody, which was the old morning service of the Church. I only add, that though this service was very early in the morning, yet it was frequented, not by the clergy and monks only, but by the people also. For, as we have seen before[74], St. Basil takes notice, that the people came to church to celebrate these morning devotions; and Sidonius has told us also, that Theodoric king of the Goths was a constant observer of them: so here it is also remarked by Cassian[75], 'that this part of the Church's devotions was with great exactness observed by many secular men, who, rising early before day, would not engage themselves in any of their most necessary and ordinary worldly business, before they had consecrated the first-fruits of all their actions and labours to God by going to church, and presenting themselves in the divine presence.' A worthy example, fit to be recorded in letters of gold, to excite the emulation of the present age[76], wherein the daily worship of God at religious assemblies is so little frequented, and by many so much despised; though the same service with that of the Ancients for substance is still retained, with some improvements, and none of the corruptions, which the superstition of darker ages brought into the devotions of the Church; as any one may

[73] Ibid. c. 11. (p. 24.) Prædictum vero duodenarium psalmorum numerum ita dividunt, ut si duo fuerint fratres, senos psallant; si tres, quaternos; si quatuor, ternos. Quo numero nunquam minus in congregatione decantant; ac proinde quantalibet multitudo convenerit, nunquam amplius psallunt in synaxi, quam quatuor fratres.

[74] See ss. 13 and 12, with nn. 59 and 53, preceding.

[75] Collat. 21. c. 26. (p. 570.) Quod devotionis genus multi etiam sæcularium summa cautione custodiunt, qui, ante lucem vel diluculo consurgentes, nequaquam familiaribus ac necessariis mundi hujus actibus implicantur, priusquam cunctorum actuum suorum operationumque primitias, ad ecclesiam concurrentes, divino studeant sacrare [al. consecrare] conspectui.

[76] [Anno 1719, the date of the publication of the fifth volume of the original edition. The space of another century and a half has nearly passed, and the remarks of the Author still remain painfully too true. Ed.]

satisfy himself, that will compare what has been delivered in this chapter with the daily service of our Church.

CHAP. XI.

The order of their daily evening service.

The evening service in most things conformed to that of the morning.

1. THE evening service, which was called the *hora lucernaris*, because it began at the *time of lighting candles*, towards the close of the day, was in most parts the same with that of the morning, only with such variation of psalms, and hymns, and prayers, as were proper to the occasion. The prayers for the catechumens, energumens, candidates of baptism, and penitents were all the same; so were the prayers for the faithful or communicants, called the prayers for the peace of the world, and the whole state of the Catholic Church, which are described at large in the following books, to which the reader may have recourse.

But they differed, first, in that a proper psalm was appointed for the evening, called the Evening Psalm by the author of the Constitutions

2. The first thing wherein they differed was, the initial psalm: for as the morning service began with the sixty-third Psalm, so the evening service is appointed to begin with the hundred and fortieth Psalm, which we reckon the hundred and forty-first: "Lord, I call upon thee, haste thee unto me, and consider my voice when I cry unto thee. Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense, and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice, &c." This Psalm the Author of the Constitutions[75] calls emphatically *τὸν Ἐπιλύχνιον Ψαλμὸν*, *the Evening Psalm*, in the place where he describes the order of this service; and though he does not in that place either name the psalm, or mention any words in it; yet he infallibly means the psalm now spoken of, because in another place[76] he expressly calls it the hundred and fortieth Psalm, requiring it to be used in public assemblies at the daily evening service.

This Psalm mentioned under the same deno-

3. And that which puts the matter beyond all dispute is, that Chrysostom in his Comment upon this Psalm takes notice of the use of it in the Church upon this particular occasion.

[75] L. 8. c. 35. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 416.) *Ἑσπέρας γενομένης συναθροίσεις τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ἐπιλύχνιον ψαλμὸν, προσφωνήσει ὁ διάκονος ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων, κ.τ.λ.*

[76] L. 2. c. 59. (ibid. p. 267.) *Ἑκάστης ἡμέρας συναθροίζεσθε ὄρθρου καὶ ἑσπέρας, ψάλλοντες καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς· ὄρθρου μὲν λέγοντες Ψαλμὸν τὸν ξβ', ἑσπέρας δὲ τὸν ρμ'.*

'Hearken diligently,' says he[77], 'for it was not without reason that our fathers appointed this psalm to be said every evening; not barely for the sake of that single expression, *Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice:* for other psalms have expressions of the same nature, as that which says, *At evening, and morning, and noon-day, will I show forth thy praise:* and again, *The day is thine, and the night is thine:* and again, *Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning:* and many other such-like psalms may one find that are proper for the evening season. Therefore our fathers did not order this psalm to be said upon the account of this expression, but they appointed the reading of it as a sort of salutary medicine to cleanse us from sin; that whatever defilement we may have contracted throughout the whole day, either abroad, in the market, or at home, or in whatsoever place, when the evening comes, we might put it all off by this spiritual charm or song, which is a medicine to purge away all such corruption.'

mination by Chrysostom and other writers.

4. After this psalm was ended, there followed the same prayers for the catechumens, energumens, penitents, and common prayers for the world and the Church, that were used in the morning service: but after them, the deacon bid the people pray in a certain form proper for the evening, which the Author of the Constitutions[78] styles *προσφώνησις ἐπιλύχνιος, the*

Secondly, proper prayers for evening service.

[77] Hom. in Ps. 140. t. 3. p. 544. (t. 5. p. 427 a.) Ἀλλὰ προσέχετε μετὰ ἀκριβείας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἁπλῶς οἶμαι τὸν ψαλμὸν τοῦτον τετάχθαι παρὰ τῶν πατέρων καθ' ἑκάστην ἑσπέραν λέγεσθαι, οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν μίαν λέξιν τὴν λέγουσαν, Ἔπαρσις τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἑσπερινή· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄλλοι ψαλμοὶ ταύτην ἔχουσι τὴν λέξιν, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος ὁ λέγων, Ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωὶ καὶ μεσημβρίας διηγήσομαι, καὶ ἐπαγγελῶ· καὶ πάλιν, Σή ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, καὶ σή ἐστιν ἡ νύξ· καὶ πάλιν, τὸ, Ἑσπέρας αὐλισθήσεται κλαυθμὸς, καὶ εἰς τὸ πρωὶ ἀγαλλίασις· καὶ πολλοὺς ἂν εὕροι τις ψαλμοὺς ἐπιτηδείους τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἑσπέρας. Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν τοῦτον τὸν ψαλμὸν ἐτύπωσαν οἱ πατέρες, ἀλλ' ὥς τι φάρμακον σωτήριον, καὶ ἁμαρτημάτων καθάρσιον ἐνομοθέτησαν λέγεσθαι· ἵν' ὅσαπερ ἂν προστριβώμεθα δι' ὅλου τοῦ μήκους τῆς ἡμέρας, ἢ ἐν ἀγορᾷ, ἢ ἐν οἰκίᾳ, ἢ ὅπου δήποτε διατρίβοντες, ταῦτα ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν ἑσπέραν διὰ τῆς ἐπῳδῆς ταύτης ἀποδυσώμεθα τῆς πνευματικῆς· φάρμακον γάρ ἐστιν ἀπάντων τούτων ἀναιρετικόν. [Conf. Hom. 73. al. 74. in Matth. p. 634. (t. 7. p. 711 d.) Πρῶτον δὲ ἄκουσον τί ψάλλων λέγεις, Κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου, κ.τ.λ. Ed.]

[78] L. 8. c. 36. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 416.) Ἀναστάντες αἰτησώμεθα τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς αὐτοῦ· τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης, τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα, Χριστιανὰ τὰ τέλη· τὴν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα εἰρηνικὴν καὶ ἀναμάρτητον, καὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἀκατάγνωστον αἰτησώμεθα· ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀλλήλους τῷ ζῶντι Θεῷ, διὰ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παραθῶμεν.

evening bidding-prayer, and it runs in these words: 'Let us pray to the Lord for his mercies and compassions; and entreat him to send us the angel of peace, and all good things convenient for us, and that he would grant us to make a Christian end. Let us pray that this evening and night may pass in peace, and without sin, and all the time of our life unblamable and without rebuke. Let us commend ourselves and one another to the living God through his Christ.'

This said, the bishop, if present, made this commendatory collect, which is there[79] styled ἐπιλύχνιος εὐχαριστία, *the evening thanksgiving*, and is conceived in the following words: 'O God, who art without beginning, and without end, the maker and governor of all things through Christ, the God and Father of him before all things, the Lord of the Spirit and King of all things both intellectual and sensible; that hast made the day for works of light, and the night to give rest to our weakness: for the day is thine, and the night is thine; thou hast prepared the light and the sun: do thou now, most kind and gracious Lord, receive this our evening thanksgiving. Thou, who hast led us through the length of the day, and brought us to the beginning of the night, keep and preserve us by thy Christ; grant that we may pass this evening in peace, and this night without sin; and vouchsafe to bring us to eternal life through thy Christ; by whom be glory, honour and adoration unto thee in the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.'

After this, the deacon bids the people *bow down to receive the benediction with imposition of hands*[80], κλίνατε τῇ χειρο-

[79] Ibid. c. 37. (p. ead.) Ὁ ἄναρχος Θεὸς καὶ ἀτελεύτητος, ὁ τῶν ὅλων ποιητὴς διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ κηδεμὼν, πρὸ δὲ πάντων αὐτοῦ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ, ὁ τοῦ Πνεύματος Κύριος, καὶ τῶν νοητῶν καὶ αἰσθητῶν βασιλεὺς, ὁ ποιήσας ἡμέραν πρὸς ἔργα φωτὸς, καὶ νύκτα εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν· σὴ γάρ ἐστιν ἡμέρα, καὶ σή ἐστιν ἡ νύξ· σὺ κατηρτίσω φαῦσιν καὶ ἥλιον· αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, Δέσποτα, φιλάνθρωπε καὶ πανάγαθε, εὐμενῶς πρόσδεξαι τὴν ἑσπερινὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἡμῶν ταύτην. Ὁ διαγαγὼν ἡμᾶς τὸ μῆκος τῆς ἡμέρας, καὶ ἀγαγὼν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτὸς, φύλαξον ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, εἰρηνικὴν παράσχου τὴν ἑσπέραν, καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἀναμάρτητον, καὶ καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· δι' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας, ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

[80] [Ibid. (p. ead.) Θεὲ πατέρων, καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους, ὁ τῇ σοφίᾳ σου κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον, τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον, τὸ θεοφιλὲς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ δοὺς αὐτῷ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς χθονὸς ἄρχειν, καὶ καταστήσας γνώμῃ σῇ ἄρχοντας καὶ ἱερεῖς, τοὺς μὲν πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν τῆς ζωῆς, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς λατρείαν ἔννομον· αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν ἐπικάμφθητι, Κύριε παντοκράτορ· καὶ ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσω-

θεσία: and then the bishop makes this following prayer: 'O God of our fathers, and Lord of mercy, that hast created man by thy wisdom a rational being, and of all thy creatures upon earth dearest unto thee, that hast given him dominion over the earth, and hast made us by thy pleasure to be kings and priests, the one to secure our lives, and the other to preserve thy lawful worship: be pleased now, O Lord Almighty, to bow down and show the light of thy countenance upon thy people, who bow the neck of their heart before thee; and bless them by Christ, by whom thou hast enlightened us with the light of knowledge, and revealed thyself unto us: with whom is due unto thee and the Holy Ghost the Comforter, all worthy adoration from every rational and holy nature, world without end. Amen.'

There are two expressions in these prayers which may seem a little unusual to a modern reader; one, where prayer is made for *the angel of peace:* and the other, which styles God the Father, *Lord of the Spirit:* but both these occur in the morning prayers for the catechumens hereafter[81], where I show out of Chrysostom, that prayer for the angel of peace was a common petition in many of the known forms of the Church: and for that other expression, which styles the Father, *Lord of the Spirit,* which is a harsh way of speaking, and looks like Macedonianism, as Cotelerius remarks upon it, I have showed out of Bishop Bull that it may fairly be interpreted to a sound and Catholic sense from parallel expressions in Justin Martyr. So that we need not condemn this author as an Arian or Macedonian heretic, only allowing him the favour of a candid interpretation.

To return therefore to the prayers themselves: the deacon, after these collects made by the bishop, dismisses the people with the usual form, as in the morning service, Προέλθετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *Depart in peace!* And this is the conclusion of the evening service, according to our author in this place.

πον σου ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου, τοὺς κάμψαντας αὐχένα καρδίας αὐτῶν· καὶ εὐλόγησον αὐτοὺς διὰ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐφώτισας ἡμᾶς φῶς γνώσεως, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας ἡμῖν σαυτόν· μεθ' οὗ σοὶ καὶ ἡ ἐπάξιος ὀφείλεται προσκύνησις παρὰ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ ἁγίας φύσεως, καὶ Πνεύματι τῷ Παρακλήτῳ, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. Grischov.]

[81] B. 14. ch. 5. s. 3.

Of the evening hymn.

5. But in another place[82] he speaks also of an evening hymn, which he styles εὐχὴ ἑσπερινὸς, *an evening prayer* or *thanksgiving*, which is a sort of doxology to God, like that used before in the morning prayer. The form is in these words: 'Praise the Lord, ye servants, O praise the name of the Lord. We praise thee, we laud thee, we bless thee, for thy great glory, O Lord and King, the Father of Christ, the unspotted Lamb, that taketh away the sin of the world. All praises, and hymns, and glory, are justly rendered unto thee, our God and Father, by thy Son, in the most Holy Spirit, for all ages, world without end. Amen! Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the glory of thy people Israel.'

It is not here said whether this hymn was for public or private use. However, that there were such sorts of hymns in use among the Ancients at the first bringing in of candles in the evening, is evident from St. Basil, who mentions one part of such an hymn, which he styles ἐπιλύχνιος εὐχαριστία, *the thanksgiving at setting up lights.* 'It seemed good,' says he[83], 'to our forefathers not to receive the gift of the evening light altogether with silence, but to give thanks immediately upon its appearance. We cannot certainly tell who was the first author of that thanksgiving at setting up lights: but this we are sure of, that the people have of old used this form of words, and no one ever charged them with impiety for so doing: Αἰνοῦμεν

[82] L. 7. c. 48. [al. 49.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 385.) Αἰνεῖτε, παῖδες, Κύριον· αἰνεῖτε τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου. Αἰνοῦμέν σε, ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, διὰ τὴν μεγάλην σου δόξαν, Κύριε βασιλεῦ, ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀμώμου Ἀμνοῦ, ὃς αἴρει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου· σοὶ πρέπει αἶνος· σοὶ πρέπει ὕμνος· σοὶ δόξα πρέπει, τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐν Πνεύματι τῷ παναγίῳ, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν. Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, Δέσποτα, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, ἐν εἰρήνῃ· ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὄφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἑτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

[83] De Spirit. Sanct. c. 29. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 86 b. n. 73.) Ἔδοξε τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, μὴ σιωπῇ τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ φωτὸς δέχεσθαι· ἀλλ' εὐθὺς φανέντος εὐχαριστεῖν· καὶ, ὅστις μὲν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίου εὐχαριστίας, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν· ὁ μέν τοι λαὸς ἀρχαίαν ἀφίησι τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ οὐδενὶ πώποτε ἀσεβεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν οἱ λέγοντες, Αἰνοῦμεν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ.

Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, *We praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God.*'

Bishop Usher[84] and Dr. Smith[85] have given us an ancient form of this kind more at large out of the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Septuagint, and some other ancient copies of the Psalter in Greek, which it may not be improper to insert in this place. It goes in some books under the title of ὕμνος ἑσπερινὸς, *the evening hymn;* and in others it is called ὕμνος τοῦ λυχνικοῦ, *the hymn said at setting up lights.* We cannot certainly say this is the same that St. Basil refers to, but all that St. Basil mentions out of that ancient hymn is now found in this; which makes it probable that they are the very same. It is as follows: 'O Jesus Christ, thou joyful light of the sacred glory of the immortal, heavenly, holy, blessed Father! we, being now come to the setting of the sun, and seeing the evening light, do laud and praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. (Or, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that is, God.) Thou art worthy to have hymns at all times sung unto thee with holy voices, O Son of God, that givest life: therefore the world glorifies thee.' Bishop Usher[86], by mistake, says this hymn was the same as the ψαλμὸς ἐπιλύχνιος, *the evening psalm,* mentioned in the Constitutions (l. 8. c. 35.); whereas indeed that evening psalm was quite another thing from this evening hymn: that being one of David's Psalms, as I showed before[87] out of Chrysostom and the Constitutions themselves; and this an hymn of human composition. Neither is it the

[84] Diatriba de Symbolis, p. 35. (Works, v. 7. p. 337.) See the next note.

[85] Account of the Greek Church, (p. 302.) Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης ἀθανάτου Πατρὸς, οὐρανίου, ἁγίου, μάκαρος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ· ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡλίου δύσιν, ἰδόντες φῶς ἑσπερινὸν, ὑμνοῦμεν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ [al. Θεόν]. Ἄξιος εἶ ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς ὑμνεῖσθαι φωναῖς ὁσίαις, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, ζωὴν ὁ διδούς· διὸ ὁ κόσμος σε δοξάζει.

[86] Loc. supr. citat. (ibid. p. 338.) Et licet Nicephoro Callisto, l. 18. Hist. Eccles. c. 51., non facile concesserim, hymnum hunc jam inde ab Apostolis per manus ecclesiæ Christi fuisse traditum; esse tamen ἐπιλύχνιον ψαλμὸν illum, cujus in Constitut. Apostolic. lib. 8. cap. 35. al. 41., facta est mentio, non multum repugnaverim. Ut, quemadmodum Græci, apud Varronem de Lingua Latina, libro 5., cum lumen afferretur, dicere fuerunt soliti φῶς ἀγαθὸν, ita et Christiani suum φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης, in laudem illius, qui est ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης Dei et Patris, canere consueverint.

[87] See s. 2. and nn. 75, 76, and 77, preceding.

same form with the evening hymn related before out of the Constitutions, but seems more likely to be that mentioned by St. Basil, which I conceive was not a form for public, but only for private devotion, to be used at home by all Christians, as a pious ejaculation or hymn to Christ, "the true Light that enlightens every man that comes into the world." But I only offer this as a conjecture, because I find not this hymn mentioned as inserted into the public offices, either by the Author of the Constitutions, or St. Basil, or any other.

Whether there were any hymns, or psalms, or lessons read in the evening service, beside the 141st Psalm.

6. But then it may be asked, where there no hymns used in the evening service? Were there no lessons read, nor psalms, besides that called *the Evening Psalm*, sung in the Church? I answer, no doubt there were in many Churches: for the custom of Churches varied in this matter; and though the Author of the Constitutions mentions them not in the rituals of the Churches he describes, yet other accounts do. For Cassian[87] describing the customary service of the Egyptian monasteries, says, 'They sung twelve psalms every morning and evening in their solemn meetings, and had two lessons read, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New, and had prayers also between the psalms; and sung the *Gloria Patri* at the end of the last psalm.' St. Jerom confirms this account, and adds, that they had a sermon made by the abbot, who was always a presbyter, every day after evening prayer. For thus he describes[88] their evening devotions: 'At nine o'clock they meet together, then the Psalms are sung, and the Scriptures are read; and prayers being ended, they all sit down, and one among them, whom they call their father, begins to discourse to them, whom they hear with the profoundest silence and veneration.' But it may be said, this perhaps was only the custom of the monasteries, and not of the

[87] Instit. l. 2. c. 6. (p. 18.) Exin venerabilis Patrum senatus .... decrevit hunc numerum, [duodecim psalmorum,] tam in vespertinis, quam in nocturnis conventiculis custodiri, quibus lectiones geminas adjungentes, id est, unam Veteris et aliam Novi Testamenti.—Vid. c. 8. (p. 20.) *De subsequente oratione post Psalmum.*

[88] Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. c. 15. [al. 35.] (t. 1. p. 117 c.) Post horam nonam in commune concurritur, Psalmi resonant, Scripturæ recitantur ex more. Et completis orationibus, cunctisque residentibus, medius quem patrem vocant, incipit disputare, &c.

Churches. In answer to which Epiphanius[89] assures us, it was the custom of the Church to have psalms and hymns continually both at morning and evening prayer. St. Austin[90] also mentions hymns as well as prayers at evening service; which implies, that they had more psalms than one sung upon that occasion. St. Hilary, upon those words of the Psalmist, [65, 8.] "The outgoings of the morning and evening shall praise thee," shows the same, when[91] he says, 'The progression of the Church to her morning and evening hymns with delight, is a great sign of God's mercy. The day is begun with prayers, and the day is closed with hymns to God.'

St. Hilary himself is said to be the author of some of those hymns, and St. Ambrose of others, which were of public use in the Church: and though some would have rejected them, because they were only of human composure, and not to be found in Scripture, yet the fourth Council of Toledo[92] ordered them to be retained in the public service of the Church, together with the hymns, *Glory be to the Father!* and *Glory be to God on high!* which were likewise of human composition. For the Eastern Churches, the like is said by Chrysostom[93] that they had hymns at night in their evening prayer, as well as morning. In the Gallican Churches they had, besides their collects and prayers, both hymns and *antiphonas*, or *chapters*, as they

[89] Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. 23. See before, ch. 9. s. 8. p. 545. n. 96. and s. 10. of this chap. n. 58, preceding.

[90] De Civitat. Dei, l. 22. c. 8. p. 1485. (t. 7. p. 667 c.) . . . Ad vespertinos illuc hymnos et orationes cum ancillis suis et quibusdam sanctimonialibus ex more domina possessionis intravit, atque hymnos cantare cœperunt.

[91] In Ps. 64. p. 231. See before, ch. 5. s. 7. p. 414. n. 69.

[92] C. 12. [al. 13.] (t. 5. p. 1709 e.) . . . Et quia nonnulli hymni humano studio in laudem Dei atque apostolorum et martyrum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut hi, quos beatissimi doctores Hilarius atque Ambrosius ediderunt; quos tamen quidam specialiter reprobant, pro eo, quod de Scripturis sanctorum canonum, vel apostolica traditione non existunt: respuant ergo et illum hymnum ab hominibus compositum, quem quotidie publico privatoque officio in fine omnium psalmorum dicimus, Gloria et honor Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto, in sæcula sæculorum, Amen. Nam et ille hymnus, quem nato in carne Christo angeli cecinerunt, Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax, hominibus bonæ voluntatis; reliqua quæ ibi sequuntur, ecclesiastici doctores composuerunt. . . . Sicut igitur orationes, ita et hymnos in laudem Dei compositos, nullus vestrum ulterius improbet, sed pari modo in Gallicia [al. Gallia] Hispaniaque celebret: excommunicatione plectendi, qui hymnos rejicere fuerint ausi.

[93] Hom. 18. in Act. p. 174. (t. 9. p. 150 d.) Οἷόν ἐστιν ἀπελθεῖν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . . καὶ λυχνικοῖς καὶ ἑωθινοῖς ὕμνοις παραγένεσθαι;

called them, collected out of the Psalms, to be said by way of *responses*, as appears from the Council of Agde[94]: and the second Council of Tours[95] orders, 'that at evening prayer, (which they call the twelfth hour of prayer,) twelve psalms should be sung, answerable to the order of morning service, which had twelve psalms, as the sixth hour of prayer had six psalms, with the additional psalm called the *Hallelujah*.' From all which it is apparent, that a considerable number of psalms and hymns were used, together with the prayers, to make up the daily course of evening, as well as morning service in many Churches.

The Lord's Prayer used in many Churches, as the conclusion of the daily morning and evening service.

7. And in some Churches the Lord's Prayer was always made a part of the daily worship both morning and evening. For the Council of Gironde[96] made a general decree for the Spanish Churches, 'that the Lord's Prayer should constantly be used by every priest at the close of the matins and vespers in the daily service.' It had always been used before on Sundays in the communion-office; but it being in the very title and tenour of it, *quotidiana oratio, a quotidian*, or *daily prayer*, they thought it proper to make it a standing part of their daily offices. And when some priests neglected to obey this order, and still confined the use of it to the Lord's-day, the fourth Council of Toledo[97] made a decree, 'that all such of the clergy as contumaciously refused to use it daily both in their public and private offices, should be degraded.'

In the French Churches the practice was the same. For by a canon of the third Council of Orleans[98] the people are

[94] C. 30. (t. 4. p. 1388 b.) . . . . Et in conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos, capitella de psalmis dici [al. dicentur] et plebem [al. plebs], collecta oratione, ad vesperam ab episcopo cum benedictione dimitti [al. dimittatur].

[95] C. 19. [al. 18.] (t. 5. p. 857 c.) . . . Patrum statuta præceperunt, ut ad sextam sex psalmi dicantur cum *Alleluia:* et ad duodecimam duodecim, itemque cum *Alleluia*.—C. 24. [al. 23] (ibid. p. 863 e.) Et licet Ambrosianos habeamus hymnos in canone, &c.

[96] C. 10. (t. 4. p. 1569 b.) . . . . Nobis [semper] placuit [observari], ut omnibus diebus post matutinas et vespertinas oratio Dominica a sacerdote proferatur.

[97] C. 9. [al. 10.] (t. 5. p. 1708 b.) Nonnulli sacerdotum in Hispaniis [al. per Hispanias] reperiuntur, qui Dominicam orationem, quam Salvator noster docuit et præcepit, non quotidie, sed tantum die Dominica dicant . . . . . Quisquis ergo sacerdotum, vel subjacentium clericorum, hanc orationem Dominicam quotidie aut in publico aut in privato officio præterierit, propter superbiam judicatus, ordinis sui honere privetur.

[98] C. 28. [al. 29.] (ibid. p. 302 e.)

obliged to stay at divine service till the Lord's Prayer was said; and if the bishop was present, to wait for him to pronounce the benediction, which shows that it was the conclusion of the prayers, since nothing came after but the benediction. It is true, the word used for divine service in this canon is *missa:* which might seem to mean the communion-service, where the Lord's Prayer was always used: but it has been shown before in the first chapter of this Book [99], that *missa* is a general name for any part of divine service; and in this canon is particularly taken for the morning and evening sacrifice of prayers. For it immediately follows, 'that no one should come to the sacrifice of morning or evening mass, (that is, morning or evening prayers,) with his arms or weapons, which only appertained to the use of war.' Besides, that in the communion-service, as we shall see hereafter, the Lord's Prayer came always in the middle, and not, as here, in the conclusion of the service.

This is the substance of what I have observed concerning the several parts and order of the daily morning and evening service in the writings of the Fathers and the canons of the Councils, which are at present the chief rituals of the ancient Church: and I have been the more careful to separate these offices from the great service of the Lord's-day, because they are too often confounded in the accounts of modern authors. I now proceed to the offices and service of the Lord's-day, which must be the subject of the two following Books.

De missis nullus laicorum ante discedat, quam Dominica dicatur oratio. Et si episcopus præsens fuerit, ejus benedictio expectetur. Sacrificia vero matutina [leg. matutinarum] missarum, vel vespertinarum, ne quis cum armis pertinentibus ad bellorum usum, expetat. [Others read, Sacrificia vero matutina vel vespertina, &c. Ed.]

[99] See particularly, s. 4. pp. 267–271, preceding.

END OF VOL. IV.

The end also of the fifth volume of the Original Edition, London, 1719.

Date Due

11/3/55			
5/11/61			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

vol. 4

BR
131
B613 10244

AUTHOR
Bingham, J.

TITLE
Works. vol.4.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
5/28	W. Boat 4-1	
10/3/55	Harold J. Ben	
4/27/61	Donald Con	